INTERPRETING THE GOOD SHEPHERD DISCOURSE IN JOHN 10:1-18 WITH A FOCUS ON LEADERSHIP IN CONTEMPORARY NIGERIA

BY

COSMAS JOOLI

BSU/REL/PhD/12/1762

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO POSTGRAUDUATE SCHOOL, BENUE STATE UNIVERSITY, MAKURDI, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD) IN RELIGIOUS STUDIES (NEW TESTAMENT).

OCTOBER, 2019

CERTIFICATION

We certify that this Thesis titled: INTERPRETING THE GOOD SHEPHERD DISCOURSE IN JOHN 10:1-18 WITH A FOCUS ON LEADERSHIP IN CONTEMPORARY NIGERIA has been duly presented by COSMAS JOOLI (BSU/REL/PhD/12/1762) of the Department of Religion and Cultural Studies, Faculty of Arts, Benue State University, Makurdi and has been approved by the Examiners.

1st Supervisor:

Signature: ……

Name: Professor Godwin N. Toryough

Date: …….

2nd Supervisor

Signature:……

Name: Victor Igbum, PhD

Date: ……

Head of Department

Signature: ……

Name: Professor Emmanuel Ordue Usue

Date: ……

Having met the stipulated requirements, the Thesis has been accepted by the Postgraduate School.

…… ……

Professor Toryina Ayati Varvar

Dean, Postgraduate School

Date:…….

DECLARATION

I, COSMAS JOOLI (BSU/REL/PhD/12/1762) do hereby declare:

a. That this Thesis has been written by me and it is an account of my research.
b. That no part of this Thesis to the best of my knowledge has been presented or published at any time anywhere for the award of any degree.
c. And also that all the quotations and references herein been acknowledged.

COSMAS JOOLI (BSU/REL/PhD/12/1762)

Sign: ……

Date: ……

DEDICATION

This Thesis is dedicated to my Mother mama Rebecca Umôngur Jooli and to all who aspire for leadership positions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am particularly indebted in thanks and appreciation to the many people without whom this research could not have been carried out. I am very grateful to God who gave me life through my parents late Pa Lawrence Ibo Jooli and Mama Rebecca Umôngur Jooli. I take off my cap in appreciation for the gift of my faith and for the gift of the priesthood.

I am profoundly indebted to my 1st Supervisor, Professor Godwin N. Toryough and my 2nd Supervisor, Victor Igbum, Ph.D who took quality time to go through this work meticulously as many times as was given to them and made useful suggestions and corrections of crossing the t's and dotting the i's. If any errors do remain, it is not for lack of effort on their part to correct them and I wholly bear responsibility. Without their judgment, this research would have been five times as big and half as good.

I am grateful to my Head of Department, Professor Emmanuel O. Usue, and other staff and Professors in the Department for their encouragement and understanding. I warmly appreciate the staff attached to the Office of the Head of Department for their kindness especially moments that they needed to help keep or pass information. I also appreciate my other Postgraduate lecturers who took me in the semester Courses and who provided guide in my research especially during the Seminar presentations. In this category I appreciate Fr Ajiki T. T. Pius PhD, Fr Kenneth A. Agede PhD, Iorjaa Igbakua PhD, Robert Kachina PhD and A.Z. Apenda PhD. You provided direction at each turn of the way. I am grateful.

My thanks and appreciation go to the Dean of Post Graduate School, Professor T. T. Varvar and all the Post Graduate representatives who were sent to examine me

in the course of Seminar paper presentations. I appreciate the former Dean, Faculty of Arts, Professor Daniel S. Shishima, the current Dean, Professor Ama Doki, the former Head of Department, Professor Joseph Sarwuan Gbenda (late). May God grant you eternal reward.

I thank and appreciate my late Bishop, Most Revd Athanasius A. Usuh for the fatherly care he provided for me. Special thanks to my present Bishop, Most Revd Wilfred Chikpa Anagbe Cmf for his support and favourable disposition for me to continue with this research. His openness and desire for his priests to be sufficiently trained deserves commendation. Thank you, My Lord Bishop.

I also want to appreciate the contributions of my priest- friends. They have always given me the desired support. In this category, acknowledge the contributions of Fr. Gabriel T. Gberikon, Fr. Daniel Ude Asue PhD, Fr. Clement Iorliam PhD, Fr. Simon Ikpum, Fr. Emmanuel Abela PhD, Fr. Benjamin Vesuwe and Fr. Godwin Bagu PhD. Those contemporaneous conversations really helped me to form a better judgment and encouraged me to take up studies in the New Testament. I also appreciate my Course Mates, John Abawua, Anthony Akaatenger, James Ukpe that we shared the anxious moments together. I thank you for your support and encouragement.

I am thankful to the Parishes and my parishioners that I worked and encountered. Special thanks to St. Francis Parish, Agagbe, St. Robert's Rectory, Adamgbe, St. Peter's Quasi Parish, Agboughul, Holy Family Parish, Kanshio and St. Theresa's Parish, High Level Makurdi. May Almighty God grant your hearts' desires. I also appreciate the Missionary Sisters of the Holy Rosary for their support and kindness, Srs. Adeline, Grace Onah, Injide, Ebere, and Julieta Muruthi. Your house

was always open for me. I am grateful to Srs. Justina Jor PhD, Jovita Kaior, Philomena Atela, Fidelia Moji, Grace Shiedu, Priscilla Ahula, Margaret Daudu SSL, and Grace E. Okon SSND. I give thanks to my brother, Mr. Alexis Jooli and his wife Mrs. Sylvia Jooli, my late brother's wife, Mrs. Ahungur Maureen Jooli, Mr.Edward Jooli (KSM), Mr. Abraham Jooli (KSJI), Benjamin Nyam and his wife Mrs. Felicia Nyam (KSM), Temanenge Akinde and all my relations. I appreciate your love, care and support.

I finally appreciate all those authors whose books and ideas I have used in different ways in the course of this research. They are too many to mention. I am very grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

CHAPTER THREE

EXEGESIS OF JOHN 10:1-18

CHAPTER FIVE

THE GOOD SHEPHERD MODEL AND CONTEMPORARY LEADERSHIP IN NIGERIA FROM 1999-2015

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

ABSTRACT

The biblical concept of 'shepherd' connotes the imagery for leadership. The Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18 along with its Old Testament background in Ezekiel 34:1-31 occured in the context of the polemics against bad leadership structures in Israel in that the powers that be wanted to maintain the *status quo*. The text has enjoyed wide readership and appreciation but has also suffered severe mis-interpretation that forms the basis of the problem of this research. Scholars were seldom unanimous about its meaning especially the meaning of *paroimia* "proverb" or more generally a *mãsãl* in Hebrew, which can mean "proverb" or "riddle," or using the familiar synoptic term, a parable. The problem was further aggravated in the pictorial usage of three different imagery: Sheepfold, Door and Good shepherd. What could be the best form of interpretation of the different imagery. The study aimed at providing the correct interpretation to the text in spite of the different images and symbols used. It was also discussed as a model of leadership and leaders were urged to see what the "Good Shepherd" does and bring it to bear on their exercise of power and authority. The researcher had used the historico-critical and synchronic methods of biblical exegesis in order to unravel the text. The biblical methods were adopted because they give a broader exploration of the text in its historical and cultural milieu and a more in-depth interpretation of the text in view. In order to contextualize the interpretation, the study looked at the challenges of leadership in Nigeria. The study found out that lack of Content, Character and Competence, absence of the spirit of sacrifice, corruption, ethnicity have negatively shaped leadership in Nigeria. This work therefore recommended: that leaders must imbibe the attributes and qualities of the Good Shepherd such as the disposition to sacrifice and lay down one's life as they take up political leadership. Their engagement in leadership should not be for self-aggrandizement but as sacrifice for the common good and the evolution of a new political culture to checkmate corruption, emphasize propriety, recognize the place of morality in politics, transparency and accountability. The study had therefore, recommended the biblical image of the "Good Shepherd" in John 10:1-18 as a universal leadership model to supplant the current concept and practice of political leadership characterized by selfishness, greed and insensitivity to the problems of the people and the looting of the commonwealth with impunity. A thorough leadership recruitment process through free and fair elections would lead to the emergence of the best leadership materials that will provide the desired leadership as exemplified by the Good Shepherd.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The word "shepherd" as used in everyday parlance is understood as someone whose job is to take care of the sheep or goats. In another sense it means to lead or guide or watch over someone or a group of people somewhere, making sure that they go where they should, leading them into or out of or towards something. It could also mean a member of the clergy, or the Shepherd, Jesus Christ. Its synonyms would be a leader, minister, pastor, pastoralist, protector etc. For the purpose of this research, shepherd is understood as a leader and as a political leader specifically. The role of the shepherd is interpreted and understood in terms of the leadership position they occupy and provide.

It is widely acknowledged that there is no direct citation from the Old Testament in John 10:1-18 even though there is a strong biblical tradition presenting unfaithful leaders of Israel as bad shepherds who consign their flock to the wolves (cf. Jer 23:1-8; Ezek 34, Zeph3:3; Zech 10:2-3; 11:4-17). This theme is continued in other Jewish literature that is pre-Christian or contemporaneous with the Fourth Gospel. Leon-Dufour asserts that throughout the Old Testament, God is repeatedly spoken of as the shepherd of his people. When the exile caused many to doubt, God was presented as the future shepherd of the people (cf. Jer 31:10; 13:17; 23:3; Isa 40:11; 49:9-10). Ezekiel 34:11-16 speaks of God as the future good shepherd gathering the flock. This image is continued into later writings (cf. Zeph 3:19, as the defender of the oppressed, Mic 2:12; 4:6-7, Yahweh gathering the sheep in an enclosure, Qoh 12:11; Sir 18:13). As the monarchy disappeared prophets spoke of a future Davidic figure who would be shepherd to the people (cf. Mic 5:3; Jer 3:15; 24:4-6; Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24; Zech13:7-9). The notion emerges of "one shepherd" who will form "one flock" (474).

> I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them; he shall feed and be their shepherd. And I, the Lord, will be their God, and my servant David shall be prince among them (Ezek 3423-24; cf. 37:24).

The image continues and strengthens in other Jewish literature and no doubt provides the background for Jesus' words in John 10:1-18. Jesus' response closes this discussion and opens the shepherd discourse and its aftermath. Moloney in his book, *The Gospel of John* separates the passage into three segments. First, '*on entering the sheepfold'* (10:1-6). He maintained that the double 'Αμην αμην λεγω 'Truly, truly I say' never introduces a totally new topic in the Fourth Gospel. There were several types of sheepfolds in use in Palestine. Here it seems to be a courtyard in front of a house surrounded by a stonewall. If a man does not enter the sheepfold by the door but climbs over the wall, it is clear that he does not belong there. He is a thief and a robber.

Bernard and others have suggested that there is more than one flock in the fold, and there would be a process of separation where each shepherd calls out his own flock.

> In the separation of the flock, possibly by name calling or any other identifiable means, the shepherd(s) would call them out for assemblage and preparatory to their daily pasture. The ability to separate and identify the flock greatly aided even as they were mixed up in pasture with other flocks (471).

This may also be suggested by the mention of a doorkeeper in verse 3 since only the larger sheepfolds would have such a guard.

The *paroimia*, therefore, is best described as an "image field" that will provide Jesus with the raw material for the formation of the later parts of the discourse. The sheep hear the voice of the shepherd (vv3-4) but the Pharisees do not hear his voice. They are unable to

recognize what he is saying to them because, as throughout the Gospel, they will not listen to what he is saying (v.6) (424).

Second, 'The contrast between the Good Shepherd and others' *(vv.7-13).* In response to the lack of understanding by his audience (verse 6) Jesus goes on. His remarks do not constitute an explanation of what he has previously said so much as an expansion. The statement is unusual; we would have expected "I am the Shepherd of the sheep." Verse 9 clarifies the meaning: the point is that Jesus is the door through which the sheep pass as they go in and out of the fold. The reference to "all who go before me" is a little difficult to understand, since the first and most obvious reference would be to Jesus' predecessors, the prophets and saints of the Old Testament. But Jesus could hardly be saying this of them; his attitude toward such people is clear in John 5:46 where he said "If you really believed in him (Moses) you would believe me since it was about me that he was writing" and John 8:56 in reference to Abraham, Jesus said "Your father Abraham rejoiced to think that he would see my Day, he saw it and was glad".

Here Jesus clarifies the meaning of his statement in verse 7. He is the Door through which the sheep pass in and out of the fold and find pasture. But if Jesus is the Door, we may ask, what does the "going forth and entering in" of the sheep refer to? The implication is that Jesus here alludes to the fact that he is the means of entry into the Kingdom. Through him, through his person and work, his sheep will find sustenance (nourishment cf. 21:15-17) and rest (in the Kingdom) (Guthrie 225).

According to Kummel, the contrast between Jesus and others continues as he claims, "I am the Good Shepherd". The positioning of the adjective after the noun 'o poimhn 'o kaloj stresses that Jesus is the good shepherd in contrast to bad shepherds, but more is being said. The shepherd of v. 2 is rendered Christological in vv. 11-13. The introduction of

the image of the Good Shepherd links Jesus with the tradition of a messianic shepherd of the people of God (212).

In a final word of condemnation Jesus stresses the negative nature of the relationship between the hireling and the sheep (v.13). The Good Shepherd gives his life for his sheep, and the hireling is only interested in personal gain. The hireling's flight flows from the nature of his relationship with the sheep. "The Jews" self-interest blocks them from accepting the fullness of the gift that comes through Jesus Christ (cf. 1:16-17).

Third, 'Jesus, the messianic Good Shepherd' *(vv.14-18)*. All conflict disappears as Jesus again announces, "I am the good shepherd" (v.14a). Jesus no longer concerns himself with others who claim to be shepherds but with the relationship he has with his flock (vv. 14-16) and with his Father (vv. 17-18). This is made clear by a spiraling play on the use of the verb "to know" γινωσκειν. Jesus is the Good Shepherd who 'knows' his sheep, and his sheep 'know' him (v14b), but behind the mutuality of the Good Shepherd and his sheep lies the fundamental mutuality between the Father and Jesus: as the Father 'knows' Jesus so also does Jesus 'know' the Father (v.15a). This mutuality can be seen in the self-gift of the Good Shepherd. The sharing of knowledge and oneness between Jesus and the sheep and between Jesus and the Father leads logically to the Good Shepherd's laying down his life for the sheep (v.15b) (Dodd 103).

Jesus further astounds his audience by announcing that there are other sheep who are not "of this fold" (v.16). The sheep is Israel and it contains some who are Christ's own sheep and some (the unbelieving Jews) who are not (Barret 376). Others will be brought into the fold so that there will be one shepherd, one-fold. The idea of one shepherd leading one people of God came from biblical tradition and continued in later Jewish literature, but something more is claimed by Jesus. He does not abandon the traditional image of the Good Shepherd, but he expands it in a way unknown to Jewish tradition (378). The Good Shepherd

lays down his life for his sheep because of the union between himself and the Father (v.15). The world outside Israel will be drawn into the fold of Jesus through his willing gift of himself unto death (v.16).

The crucial function of the relationship between Jesus and the Father dominates Jesus' final words on the Good Shepherd (vv.17-18). The Father's love for Jesus is shown in Jesus' laying down his life so that he might take it up again (v.17). According to Bultmann, what is being said here is that in his sacrifice the Father's love for him is truly present, and that this sacrifice is therefore, a revelation of the Father's love (384). Jesus will willingly die a violent death but will take his life again because the Father loves him.

This résumé of the background of the Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18 highlights the issues that will be dealt with in the research and has provided a broader horizon to properly situate the Discourse in contemporary Nigeria leadership and get the desired meaning and interpretation of the Text in question.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The text of John 10:1-18 has enjoyed tremendous readership and appreciation but at the same time has suffered severe mis-interpretation. Scholars are scarcely unanimous about its meaning especially the meaning of *paroimia "*proverb" or more generally a *mãsãl* in Hebrew, which can mean "proverb," or "riddle," or using the familiar synoptic term, a "parable." The problem is further aggravated in the pictorial usage of three different imagery: sheepfold, Door and Good shepherd. For the passage of John 10:1-18 presents a wholistic interpretation of the mission of Jesus Christ as perceived by the Johannine community but leaves more unanswered questions regarding its best form of grasping the reality of the salvific role of Christ and how the first audience were to understand it in light of the different imagery (Brown 968). Even the location of this story has often disturbed commentators who fail to see links with what precedes and what follows. It is the presence of these divergent

views regarding the text that the researcher determines its root interpretation and understanding.

Many researchers and biblical scholars have tried in commendable ways to unravel the correct interpretive meaning of the images used by Jesus in his relationship with the flock as primarily pastoral/spiritual as well as vicarious but seldom see how this can apply also to contemporary leaders in concrete life situation as they take up the responsibility of leadership in the political realm. The study establishes that Jesus' care for the sheep is not only in pastoral/spiritual terms. It applies to all that the sheep need to have life in its fullness, life as God created it with all the needs that go with it, including light, water, employment, security, adequate wages, means of transportation and communication, housing, and so forth. These are the things that political leaders ought to provide for the ruled. The study is undertaken using the context of political leadership in Nigeria, which is linked to the Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18.

1. 3. AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study is to solve the interpretive problem posed by John 10:1-18 and the challenges of leadership in Nigeria. The objectives of the study are to:

(i) Carry out a correct interpretation of the Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18 in spite of the different images and symbols used,

(ii) Provide insight into the semantics of the text

(iii) Examine the vicarious and substitutionary death of Jesus, the Shepherd *par excellence*,

(iv) Contextualize the Good Shepherd Discourse in the light of the challenges of leadership in Nigeria, and

(v) Make the 'Good Shepherd' imagery as a leadership model for leaders in Nigeria.

1. 4. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The biblical scope of this study is John 10:1-18, its exegesis and hermeneutics read within the local context of leadership challenges in Nigeria from 1999 to 2015. The choice of this biblical pericope is largely because of the basis it provides for a better understanding and the implications and the attributes of leadership as depicted in the Gospel of John 10:1-18. Many interpretations could be given to the text of John 10:1-18 but the imagery of shepherd as an altruistic and vicarious leader comes out more glaringly. Furthermore, the choice of the above time frame of 1999-2015 represents the longest period of uninterrupted democratic governance in Nigeria. During this period, different people at different times and on different platforms provided leadership in Nigeria. A study of this kind would help to bridge the gap between the supposedly pastoral/spiritual role of Jesus as the Good Shepherd and leadership in the political realm in contemporary Nigeria.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Many biblical scholars and researchers had in the past done some profound studies on the themes of the Good Shepherd as presented in the Fourth Gospel and propounded different theories on leadership. Some have even attempted to bring the themes to bear one on another. At some time, the Good Shepherd is interpreted purely in the pastoral/spiritual sense urging pastors of souls to emulate the example of the Good Shepherd. This interpretive method though good, leaves much to be desired. This interpretation only gives religious meaning and excludes many people who do not belong to the subjective interpretation of the text.

This work, however, seeks to bridge the gap and widen the interpretive horizon of the Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18 to include religious leaders but to also go beyond it to others who also hold positions of leadership or aspire to hold it, especially political leadership. Since the mission of Christ is to make us have life in full, no true human situation

should be left out in pursuit of this eternal goal. This work is important for contemporary Nigeria because as indicated above, it will bridge the gap of understanding between religious leadership and secular understanding of it.

The work is also significant because it will help to contexualize the biblical passage to unravel concrete ways of how political leaders in Nigeria who should behave like the Good Shepherd in the Fourth Gospel in their relationship and dealings with the ordinary people who are considered to be 'sheep'. This work will be of tremendous benefit especially to the generality of Nigerians who will be the direct beneficiaries of this ideal form of leadership exemplified in the Good and Noble shepherd. This is because when it is applied in the machinery of political leadership in Nigeria, it will bring life in its fullness with all the real needs that go with it, including light, water, security, housing and so forth hence it is in the political sphere that such decisions are made and policies are formulated. This will go further to improve the quality of life and well-being of the people that are led. These can only be provided by a leadership that follows the example of the Good Shepherd in their noble and sacrificial service.

It is important to add here that though as a religious pluralistic society, not all political leaders will have this Christian biblical background since other leaders may come from other religions practised in Nigeria, it is profound that those who do not profess Christianity will still not find the Good Shepherd model of leadership obnoxious. It therefore, becomes an eye-opener and a springboard for all leaders of various religious and political background.

1.6. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

If one is going to arrive at the correct message of the text in the Bible, one must use a systematic plan or procedure in his study of it. He must have a method in his approach to scripture. Lack of method can only result in a puzzling, chaotic application of the word. The research methodology adopted is library research and experiential. The library research

focuses mainly on the synchronic interpretation of John 10:1-18 in its social, political, historical and literary contexts. "Synchronic" here comes from the Greek, which means "simultaneous". It explores a system of language in the form that it has at a definite point in time. This method explores a system of language that helps to understand better the text under consideration. It deals with the literary genre and form of the text and also deals with the lexical, grammatical and syntactical analysis that include vocabulary, forms of words and their arrangement and semantic content, which deals with study of meaning of words of the text (Grant and Tracy 97).

Biblical exegesis is done in different ways. For the purpose of this work, the researcher will use the hermeneutical method of analysis. The term "hermeneutics" has its basis in Greek mythology. It is derived from "Hermes" the Greek messenger of the gods and the interpreter of Jupiter. According to the Webster's New Seventh Collegiate Dictionary, hermeneutics is "the science of interpretation or the study of the methodological principles of interpretation" (as of the Bible) (389). According to the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Vol. 111,* interpretation is a generic term and may refer to any work of literature. Referred specifically to sacred Scriptures, the science of interpretation is generally known as hermeneutics, while the practical application of the principles of this science is exegesis (1489). Exegesis (from *ex*, out, and *egeisthas*, to guide or lead) means to lead out. It is the application of the principles of hermeneutics in bringing out the meaning of any biblical writing which might otherwise be difficult to understand (Dungan, 231).

According to Baker's Dictionary of Theology, the relationship of hermeneutics to exegesis is, whereas hermeneutics seeks to establish the ruling principles of biblical interpretation, exegesis seeks to fix the meaning of individual statements and passages (204). The exegetical methods formulated by modern biblical criticism have blazed new trails for an approach to the Bible. This method has helped researchers to go back to the historical and

cultural milieu in which a scriptural passage took shape and have a better contextualization of its original meaning. Hermeneutics deals with the interpretation of texts – or of events gathered up in language. It focuses specifically on constructing and discovering the appropriate rules of interpreting the Bible. According to Croatto, hermeneutics stands in the same relationship to exegesis that a rulebook stands to a game (9). The rules are not the game, and the game is meaningless without the rules. Exegesis is applied hermeneutics. These biblical methods will be used to formulate judgement of the text.

1.7 ORGANIZATION OF CHAPTERS

This research is organized in six chapters. Chapter one introduces the research topic by providing a background to the study. It provides the statement of the problem of the research work and the aim and objectives of the study. It also provides the scope and significance of the study. Furthermore, it states the research methodology and definition of terms and concepts. In chapter two, there is a review of related literature. Here different authors and their opinions are x-rayed pertaining to the Good Shepherd, his disposition and the challenges of leadership in contemporary Nigeria. Chapter three provides an exegesis of John 10:1-18, highlighting concepts as they appear in the text. Chapter four discusses the hermeneutical interpolation of John 10:1-18 and the challenges of leadership in Nigeria. Chapter five further discusses the Good Shepherd model of leadership in the light of contemporary leadership from 1999 to 2015. Finally, chapter six brings out the summary of the research, its contribution to knowledge, recommendations and conclusion.

1.8 DEFINITION OF TERMS AND CONCEPTS

1.8.1 Good Shepherd

Jesus designates this title to himself in the 'I am Sayings' section in the Fourth Gospel. The adjective qualifying the shepherd is sometimes translated as 'noble', 'ideal', 'model', 'true', or 'good'. According to Brown, the adjective is *kaloj* not *agaqoj*, and these

two words refer to quite different semantic domains although they were linked together in certain circumstances. The opposite of *kaloj* is shame - *aiscroj* while the opposite of *agaqoj* is *ponhroj*, which is best, understood in terms of the cultural value of honour and shame, which is not the same as the moral sphere of good and evil. For the purpose of this research, the adjectives 'noble' or 'good' will be used interchangeably to describe the action and disposition of the shepherd. The evangelist, moreover, labels the shepherd 'noble' for two reasons. First, because he lays down his life for the sheep (Brown 386) and second, he knows his sheep (10:14). In relation to Jesus, the Good Shepherd, some commentators like Bultmann (356) and Kasper (198) add one more reason from 10:17-18, which refers to the 'voluntary' and 'substitutionary' character of the death of the shepherd, a traditional criterion of a 'noble' death.

The term 'shepherd' was discussed deeper in an earlier section, precisely in the background to the study and will be discussed further in the work. Here the researcher shall only provide supplementary clarification of the concept. The term shepherd, a derivative from the Latin pastor, is the name given to those who take care of a herd of sheep. There is a wide and profound use of the concept in both the Old and the New Testaments. In ancient times, and especially in the Middle Eastern cultures, this term was commonly used because it was very easy to identify its cultural significance. According to Fee Gordon, the shepherd was one who tended the sheep, taking them to greener pastures, searching for water for them for refreshment, taking care of the weak and wounded ones, and protecting them from the attacks of predators and ultimately being ready to sacrifice their lives for the sheep (Gordon 321).

Jesus must have been conversant with the life, functions of the shepherd, cherished it and attributed to himself the title. The shepherd did not see his responsibility as a job for

gratification but saw it as a vocation worth dying for. The shepherd was simultaneously a leader and a companion. He was a strong man who was capable of defending his flock against wild beasts. His authority was not disputed; it was based on his devotion and love. His relationship with the flock was so profound and unique that despite the large number of the sheep, the shepherd knew them all by their names. According to Leon-Dufur, apart from this, in the ancient East (Babylonia and Assyria), the kings liked to consider themselves shepherds to whom the divinity had entrusted the duty of gathering together and caring for the sheep of his flock. Against this background, the Scripture describes in detail the relations, which unite Israel with God (542). Jesus helps in the understanding of a shepherd with these attributes. He says:

> He who enters through the gate is the shepherd of the flock, the gatekeeper lets him in, the sheep hear his voice, and one by one he calls his own sheep and leads them out. When he has brought out all those that are his, he goes ahead of them, and the sheep follow because they know his voice. They will never follow a stranger, but will run away from him because they do not recognize the voice of strangers (John 10:2-5).

Normally a shepherd is one who owns and tends flock. He can also let his sons (Gen 34:5; 37:2; 1Sam 16:11) or daughters (Gen 29:9; Ex 2:16) or paid labourers to do it for him. The duty of the shepherd in the main was to care for the flock by finding pasturage and watering places for the sheep, a task that was not always easy (Gen 31:40). It was also their duty to protect the sheep against beasts of prey and thieves (1Sam 17:34). According to Umoh, his work was both demanding and risky and yet he willingly identified with the sheep. Such care that a shepherd showed to his flock became the classic image of God's care for his people (286).

1.8.2 Leadership

In order to get an understanding on the concept of Leadership it is important to look at different definitions and shades of meaning of the concept which will be treated deeper in the section of Review of Related Literature. A study and analysis of the popular definitions on leadership reveals that most definitions tend to focus on the individual traits and characteristics. No single definition can be said to be better than the other, as all of them contain the elements that make up what leadership is. Leadership is a process of social influence, maximizes the efforts of others, towards the achievement of a goal. Someone can only be said to be leader if they have followers (Warren 56).

There are different kinds of leadership such as ecclesiastical, social, traditional, and political. This study deals with political leadership. There also different levels of political leadership such as but not limited to, Local Government Chairmen, Councilors, Governors, State and National Assembly members, and the President and all those who engage in public service. Political Leadership here refers to the ruling class that bears the responsibility of managing the affairs and resources of a political entity by setting and influencing policy priorities affecting the territory through different decision-making structures and institutions created for the orderly development of the territory. It could also be described as the human element that operates the machineries of government on behalf of an organized territory. This includes people who hold decision- making positions in government, and people who seek those positions, whether by means of election, coup d'état, appointment, electoral fraud, conquest, right of inheritance or other means (69). Broadly defined, however, political leadership goes beyond the ruling elites that directly manage the affairs of a territory; it embraces the totality of the political class that has the capacity to manipulate the machineries of government even from behind the scene.

The research deals with the office of the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria who sits in the saddle as the political leader and Head of Nigeria and how he manages the affairs of the State.

1.8.3 Contemporary Nigeria

The concept, 'Contemporary Nigeria' could be understood in different perspectives. But what the researcher intends it to be understood in the context of this work is not chronological but the things happening now or recently in Nigeria especially in the political realm as it patterns leadership. So, for the purpose of this work, 'Contemporary Nigeria' is conceptualized to mean the things that are now or have happened recently and more specifically from 1999-2015.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The researcher in this section will review related literature based on themes that are related and relevant to the topic of the thesis. This will include: (i) The authorship of John's Gospel (ii) The Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18, (iii) Leadership in general, (iv) Leadership in Nigeria(v) Noble Death in Greek Tradition (vi) Funeral orations and noble death (vii) Nobel death tradition and the Greek Literature (viii) The death of the 'Good' Noble Shepherd (ix) Shepherd in the Old Testament (x) Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18, (xi) Jesus' death as substitution under which sub themes will be discussed such as: Substitution for Israel, substitution for humanity and finally, the concept of inclusive substitution.

2. 1. AUTHORSHIP OF JOHN'S GOSPEL

According to Keener, the question of authorship is not decisive for substantial historical reliability, even an eyewitness could have adapted information considerably, whereas a secondhand source (like Luke) could have accurately preserved earlier tradition (82). To assume that the traditional title of this work gives us an adequate answer to the question I have just posed would be extremely naive. Modern biblical scholarship has shown over the past few centuries that the traditional authorship of a number of biblical books

simply cannot be taken for granted, without a great deal of further examination and discussion of the issue. This is nowhere truer than in relation to John's Gospel. According to Jn. 21:20-24, the author of the Fourth Gospel comes into picture as an anonym but as the disciple whom Jesus loved. Traditionally, the oldest witness and confirmation of this authorship was laid by church father Irenaeus, (202 A.D) who said that the author was one of the twelve disciples, Apostle John the Son of Zebedee.

Consequently, for those approaching this research work without the presupposition that the Church's traditions regarding authorship are accurate (that is, hopefully, all Protestants and most other modern readers), the question becomes, "Why should one attribute this Book to a particular Galilean fisherman who followed Jesus, rather than to any other of the large number of followers that he had?" If one jettisons Church tradition as providing authoritative answers to this question, then one is essentially left only with the internal evidence within the Gospel itself. And within the Gospel of the "Beloved Disciple", the author or source of information for the Fourth Gospel, thus simply remains anonymous as being observed above (unless of course Jn. 11:3 tells us who he is). We may nevertheless set aside the traditional question of authorship in terms of giving the author a name, and focus instead of the author inasmuch as he can be known from the hints given within the book he wrote.

However, before doing so, it should be mentioned that, even if one concludes that John *ben* Zebedee was not the author, this need not necessarily mean that the author's name was not "John". Other earliest Church Fathers indeed speak of the author of the Gospel as John the Disciple and John the Elder (Osweto 20). However, it is not immediately apparent that this person is the same individual as John *ben* Zebedee, one of the Twelve. And so, it may be that 'John' is the right name, even if tradition has assumed this to refer to the wrong John. Also intriguing, however, is the suggestion (hinted at above of the beloved disciple)

that Lazarus might be the source behind the Gospel. In Jn. 11:3 Lazarus is called 'the one whom you (i.e. Jesus) love' but this is mere suggestion and I have no evidence whether this had been brought to scrutiny before by theologians and other biblical scholars. It should be noted that the verb used is *filew* rather than *a.gapaw*, but the two are essentially synonymous to John. In essence, therefore, if Lazarus were the source, this would explain the Gospel's interest in Jesus' visits to the Jerusalem area, rather than focusing on the Galilean ministry, as do the Synoptics. It would also explain the connection between Luke and John at a number of points, including the presence in Luke of a story about Martha and Mary (Lk.10:38-42), who are said to be Lazarus' sisters in the Gospel of John. Moreover, if Lazarus were the beloved disciple, then the fact that he had been raised from the dead would also explain as well as justify the rumor that he would not die. All of this evidence a court would probably consider circumstantial evidence, but that does not make it any less intriguing (Keener 86).

According to Kummel, at least as interesting and important as the issue of the author is concerned is the context in which he wrote. For, as one quickly discovers when reading John, the context in which the Gospel was written appears to have had a very profound influence in shaping its content as a whole. It is thus more important in John's Gospel than in perhaps any other New Testament book to learn to read it on two levels. On the one hand, John's story claims to be about a historical figure, Jesus, who lived some decades earlier. On the other hand, this claim cannot be taken at face value, since in John one finds that Jesus, John the Baptist, and the narrator all speak in the same way, a way that bears close resemblance also to the language, expressions, and turns of phrase in the Johannine Epistles (Kummel 601). So, it is clear that, at the very least, the author has passed any traditional material he has inherited through the lens of his own unique perspective and language. According to Brown, in fact, those who know the Gospel of John well should not be

surprised to find that a voice other than that of the historical Jesus, mentioned previously, is to be found in it (611). The author gives a great deal of attention to the role of the *Paraclete*, the "other comforter", the Spirit of Truth who will reveal things that Jesus could not say while physically present with the disciples on earth (cf. Jn. 16:12-13).

In this regard, a number of scholars have focused attention on the unique perspective of the Fourth Gospel's authorship, as the explanation of this work's distinctive features, and clearly there is some truth in this. Explanations along these lines as proposed by authors like Robinson and Hengel focus on the unique perspective that the Fourth Evangelist had, much as Plato and Xenophon had different perspectives on the work of Socrates. However, much of this may be part of the explanation of the Fourth Gospel's distinctiveness, it quickly becomes obvious that all four Gospels had unique authors, and so while this author's unique perspective and style are important, they are not the only factors that interest theologians in looking for an explanation of why John is unique. When we read or study any piece of writing, if we ask why the author wrote what he or she did, we are usually looking for something beyond the level of "He wrote what he did because he was Daniel Scheon and not Judith Osweto" or "because he was Lukas Saoboda and not William Shakespeare". In the same way, we are unlikely to be satisfied with an answer that says that John wrote what he did, as he did, because he was not Matthew, Mark or Luke. When we ask the question 'Why?', we are interested not just in the level of the individual author, as important as that may be, but also in the realm of context. What factors, what social setting, what contemporary problems and issues, what influences led him to write as he did? (Kummel 311).

Furthermore, there are lately Syriac manuscripts that contain remarkable statements that can throw more light to this question of Johannine authorship. These statements are found in Mingana Syriac 540 which contains the Peshitta New Testament of the East Syrian Church. The manuscript is relatively modern as it is dated Saturday, 23rd September, of the

year 2060 of the Greeks (AD 1749), but it is a faithful copy of a much older original, which may be ascribed to about AD 750. It has the following statements: before the Gospel of John, occurs the following statements: "The holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ (according to) the preaching of John the younger," and at the end of the Gospel itself (fol. 129) is the following colophon: "Here ends the writing of the holy Gospel (according to) the preaching of John who spoke in Greek in Bithynia." (Mingana 711).

The above two statements are certainly remarkable in that they deviate considerably from the a constant tradition of the church known to every historian and Biblicist, to the effect: (a) that the Apostle John wrote his Gospel at Ephesus and not in Bithynia (b) that the Fourth Gospel was written by John the Apostle himself after the other three evangelists, called the Synoptics, had composed theirs, and not by a John called the younger, a term which evidently implies that there was also another John, who by hypothesis would be John the elder. It is useful here to add that the above statements are not found in any other Syriac manuscript of the Gospels. This is true in the case of the MSS preserved in the British Museum in the Vatican and in many other Gospel MSS. Indeed, the colophons of all these MSS, definitely state: "Here ends the Gospel of John who spoke in Greek at Ephesus" and never "in Bithynia" (715).

Mingana further set forth a third document, the text of which is given below, because it has some bearing on the matter under discussion. At the end of the same MS, is a treatise attributed by the scribe to Eusebius of Caesarea, which contains a short historical account of the twelve Apostles and the seventy Disciples of our Lord. The wording of the documents is in two places slightly ambiguous but the general meaning of its sentences may be considered as certain. In the section devoted to John the evangelist (ff.267^{b}-268^{a}) it states that after he had preached in Asia he was banished by Tiberius to the island of Patmos where, eventually, he went to Ephesus where he was followed by three of his disciples: (a) Ignatius, who

afterwards became bishop of Antioch and was martyred in Rome by having been thrown before wild beasts, (b) Polycarp, who became later bishop of Smyrna and obtained the crown of martyrdom by fire, (c) John to whom the Apostle John granted priesthood and the episcopal See after him. When the Apostle John reached old age, he died and was buried by his disciple John who succeeded the Apostle in the See of Ephesus. The tombs of both John the Apostle and John his disciple are at Ephesus but the former is hidden, "and it is John the disciple who wrote the Revelations as he states that he heard all that he wrote from the mouth of John the evangelist" (716).

According to this document there are, therefore, two Johns: John the apostle and John his disciple who wrote the "Revelations." It does not, however, like the previous one, attribute the authorship of the fourth Gospel to John "the younger," but we may infer in the absence of a third John, that the epithet "the younger" applied to the John mentioned in the previous document may be somewhat explained by the hypothesis that it designates "the younger John" the pupil of "the elder John," who in this case would be the Apostle himself. However that may be, is it not possible to believe that the word "evangelist" used here after the name of John does not imply definitely that he actually wrote the Gospel, but only alludes to the mere fact that he was the John whose name the fourth Gospel was, in the popular belief, written?

A well-known hypothesis of Harnack is to the effect that the fourth Gospel is to be attributed to John the elder, a disciple of the Apostles, who has embodied in his work some words of his master so that it might rightly be called "the Gospel of John the elder according to John, son of Zebedee (56).

An influential figure in sparking off the authorship and contemporary interest in *The History of the Johannine community* as a key to understanding the Fourth Gospel is J. L. Martyn's work. He asks towards the beginning of his trend-setting study, "May one sense

even in [the Fourth Gospel's] exalted cadences the voice of a Christian theologian who writes in response to contemporary events and issues which concern, or should concern, all members of the Christian community in which he lives?" Martyn answers this question in the affirmative, and thus emphasizes, "when we read the Fourth Gospel, we are listening both to tradition and to a new and unique interpretation of that tradition with its author. Martyn is suggesting that attention to the context in which John wrote, and the needs of the church for which he wrote, can illuminate the question of why the Evangelist wrote as he did and that illuminates further on his personality (19). Martyn's work was pioneering in calling for a reading of John's Gospel on two levels. As we go on to examine the distinctive features of the Fourth Gospel's theology, it will be crucial to have in mind some information about the Christian community that produced this Gospel and about the context in which they lived and wrote and formulated their theology. This enables us to attest the authority of Johannine authorship and we can draw conclusion based on the understanding of his community.

Keener asserts that the internal evidence also claims that the author was an eyewitness, claim that should not be lightly dismissed or reinterpreted to suit more ambiguous evidence. Westcott argues that the eyewitness must have been one of the Twelve, given the scenes to which he was an eyewitness, including the scene parallel to the synoptic Last Supper (Mk 14:17). These scenes and the disciple's role further narrow him down to the innermost circle of Jesus. The Synoptics list three closest disciples to Jesus: Peter, James and John. Since Peter is contrasted with the beloved disciple in their marathon race on early Easter Sunday morning, and James died early in the century (Acts 12:2), this leaves John for the special role of the "disciple whom Jesus loved" who could have probably written the Gospel (Keener 90).

2.2. GOOD SHEPHERD DISCOURSE IN JOHN 10-1-18

Some New Testament references used a shepherd and the sheep to illustrate Christ's relationship to His followers who referred to Him as "our Lord Jesus –the great Shepherd of

the sheep" (Heb.13: 20). Jesus spoke of Himself as "the good shepherd" who knew His sheep and would lay down His life for them (Jn. 10:7-18). Jesus commissioned Peter to feed His sheep (Jn 21). For Moltmann in his book, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimension,* the synoptics give numerous characteristics, which herald the Johannine allegory. The birth of Jesus in Bethlehem fulfilled the prophecy of Micah (Mtt. 2:6; Mic. 5:1). His merciful approach proves Him to be the shepherd that Moses wanted (Nm 27:17), for He comes to the aid of the sheep who have no shepherd (Mtt. 9:36; Mk. 6:34). And Jesus sees Himself as sent to the lost sheep of Israel (Mtt. 15:24; 10:6; Lk. 19:10). Finally, at the end of time, the Lord of the sheep shall separate the good from the wicked in the flock (Mtt. 25: 31ff) (311).

In the fourth gospel these scattered marks form a grandiose that depicts the living Church under the staff of one shepherd (Jn. 10). As in Ezekiel (Ezek.34:17), it is a matter of judgement (Jn. 9:39). Israel is like harassed sheep given over to "thieves and brigands" (Jn. 10: 1, 10), dispersed. Jesus is still more explicit. He is the one mediator, the doorway to the sheep and to the pastures. He alone delegates the pastoral power. He alone gives life in the full liberty of going and coming. Finally, Jesus is the perfect shepherd because He gives His life for the sheep (Jn. 10:15, 17ff). He is not only struck but of Himself, He lays down His life (Leon-Dufour 542).

Jesus now puts the events of chapter 9 into perspective by contrasting himself, the Good Shepherd, with the Pharisees, whom he identifies with the evil shepherds of Ezekiel 34. "The `Pharisees' have expelled from God's flock the man whom Christ Himself enlightened. They are scattering the sheep whom Christ came to gather". Dodd in *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* brings out Jesus' estrangement from official Judaism and argues that even though estranged from his people, Jesus would become the indispensable shepherd of Israel and would offer his life (359). By referring to himself as the shepherd of the flock he is

appropriating further divine language. In the Old Testament, the leaders of the people are called shepherds, especially Moses (Ps 77:20) and David (Ps 78:70-72; Ezek 34:23). But God is the shepherd *par excellence*. Jeremiah and Ezekiel in particular develop the shepherd motif to express how God cares for his people and his condemnation of false and evil rulers. This position is supported by Joachim Jeremias in *New Testament Theology*. He writes that God will condemn the false shepherds (Jer. 23:1-2; Ezek. 34:1-10) and appoint faithful shepherds to tend his flock after the manner of his own heart (Jer. 3:15; 23:4). Indeed, the coming Davidic Messiah will be God's shepherd for his flock (Ezek. 34:23-24), a prophecy given in the context of God's announcement that he himself will come to shepherd his flock. He will search for his scattered flock, gather them from the nations and lead them to good pasture on the mountains of Israel (313). He will tend the weak and injured but will judge those sheep who only look after themselves and harm the others (Ezek. 34:11-22).

In these passages God shepherds through his designated leaders. Jesus is claiming such a role for himself, but in a way unlike anything seen before. He has made clear claims to divinity and messiahship, which will be repeated shortly (Jn. 10:22-39). So, when he claims to be the shepherd he is claiming that Messiah has come and in him God himself has come to shepherd his people. Jesus begins with a scene from everyday life, though the exact nature of this scene is uncertain. According to Bailey in *The Cross & the Prodigal,* the background is from village life where each family owns a couple of sheep for personal use. The animals stay at night in the courtyard of the family's house. Families on a given street agreed as to who will shepherd their combined flock, often designating one or more of the children. In the morning this shepherd went down the street to gather the sheep. The person at the door recognized the shepherd and opened the door for the sheep to pass through. The shepherd had a distinct call or whistle, sometimes using a small flute, which the sheep recognized and

followed. When several flocks ended up at a watering place at the same time and mingle together; they were easily separated again by the shepherd, who gave his call as he started to walk away. In addition to their own distinctive call, some shepherds also gave their sheep names (168).

According to Schoonenberg Piet in his book, *The Christ* Jesus contrasts those who enter through the gate and those who do not (vv. 1-2). The one who has legitimate business and authorization enters in the proper fashion, while those without authorization use underhanded means. He says

> By Jesus bringing to the fore those who are legitimate and those who are not suggests that even his flock will be separated: the ones on the left and the ones on the right. This explains intrinsically his disposition to deal with both according to their conduct (92).

These thieves and robbers did not have in mind the good of the sheep but rather selfish ends of their own. The shepherd was recognized by the one who guarded the fold, and so his entrance was natural, out in the open, without forcing. Such has been Jesus' entrance into this world and amongst his own people. He had come in the appropriate manner, having been sent by the Father. The focus here, however, was not on a general call, for he called *his own sheep by name*. This shepherd knew each particular sheep. They were "not simply units in a flock".

Jesus refers to bringing out *all his own* (v. 4). The word for *brought out* (εκβαλλο) is the same word used to describe the leaders' throwing the congenitally blind man out of the synagogue (9:34-35). The picture of the shepherd who *leads them out* (v. 3) to find pasture and water thus interprets what has just occurred to the man born blind. Jesus goes on ahead of his sheep, calling them as Bailey has described, and they follow him *because they know his voice* (v. 4). They don't follow strangers; indeed, they flee from them, *because they do not*

recognize a stranger's voice (v. 5). The word to *know* and *recognize* are the same word in Greek (οιδα)*,* so the sheep will be known by whom they know. Here is a beautiful picture of both divine sovereignty in the shepherd's call and the human response in the hearing, knowing and following by the sheep. We also find the theme of discernment, since there are more voices calling to them than just their own shepherd's. The sheep are to *enter through* Jesus (v. 9). So, the image is not that of a door as a barrier for protection, but of a door as a passageway. (Beasley Murray 169).

Jesus also refined his earlier reference to the thief and robber (v. 1), saying, *all who ever came before me were thieves and robbers* (v. 8). This was a sweeping generalization. If it were not for references to Moses, the prophets and John the Baptist as witnesses to Jesus (for example, 1:17, 19-36; 5:39), then they would seem to be included in the category of *all who ever came before me.* But the context of our passage is the condemnation of the Jewish rulers, some of whom have rejected Jesus and others who have faith in him. This sweeping statement shows that these leaders are members of a much larger group. Jesus, the one mediator of salvation, contrasted himself with all others who would claim to be "mediators of salvation" (170). The reason Moses, the law giver, the prophets and John the Baptist are not included in this condemnation is precisely because they bear witness to Jesus. All who do not bear witness to Jesus, who alone has seen the Father and makes him known (1:18), are not of the truth. They do not bring blessing but rather take it away, like a thief or a robber.

The one who enters by Jesus has the liberty *to come in and go out.* According to Joachim Jeremias in *New Testament Theology* this is an Old Testament expression often used in political and military contexts to refer to leadership (for example, Deut 31:2, "to lead you"), but it is also used elsewhere in a more general sense to refer to the entirety of one's daily activities (Deut 28:6, 19; Ps 121:8; cf. Acts 1:21). In the next section (vv. 11-18) he will explain further this life he has come to offer, which embraces all that make life worth living.

The Good Shepherd Lays Down His Life for His Sheep (10:11-18) Jesus says, *I am the good shepherd* (v. 11), an "I am" saying that, like the others, ultimately concerns the issue of life. He has just promised life *to the full* (v. 10), and he now says this life comes through his death (vv. 11, 15, 17-18). Once again, he starts with a familiar image in his audience's life, since shepherds commonly had to deal with the problem of wild animals (cf. Gen 31:39; 1 Sam 17:34-37). A good shepherd, one who is worthy of admiration (καλος), would risk his life to protect the sheep. But Jesus did not merely risk his life; he consciously gave his life for the sake of his sheep (Jeremias, 496).

Jeremias further opines that the idea of a voluntary and vicarious death for the sheep is not found in the Old Testament nor elsewhere. The closest conceptual background is that of the suffering servant of Isaiah 53. While this servant is likened to a sheep rather than a shepherd (Is 53:7), it is said of him that "the Lord makes his life a guilt offering" (Is 53:10). The expression in John 10, *lays down his life,* could be taken as a translation of "makes his life" (710). For the sheep does not in itself necessarily speak of sacrifice, but in John it does. So again, Jesus' death is seen to be central to his task.

This death makes him the shepherd that is *good (*kaloj). This word refers in such a context to that which is beautiful, noble, honorable, worthy of praise. In other words, Jesus is fulfilling his job as a shepherd in an exemplary fashion so that such goodness is able to be perceived. Jesus goes on to contrast the shepherd who will risk his life for the sheep with a hireling who runs from the wolf and leaves the sheep behind to be attacked (harpazei, literally, "snatched" or "carried off") and scattered. They are not his sheep, and he does not care about them (Jn 10:12-13). This picture is not so much an allusion of Ezekiel 34 as a development from it. In Ezekiel the danger from wild animals arises after the sheep have been scattered (Ezek 34:5, 8), and the false shepherds are indeed shepherds, though like the

hireling they care nothing for the sheep. So, there are some general associations with Ezekiel, which may suggest that Jesus is continuing his condemnation of the leadership of Israel. But the main point seems to focus on the character of the Good Shepherd, specifically, his care for the sheep.

His care for the sheep addresses two problems, the lack of care on the part of the hireling and the threat of scattering by the wolf. Elsewhere the wolf is an image of false teachers who come both from outside the community and from within (Mt 7:15; Acts 20:29-30). Such a problem was present in John's day in Ephesus, since Paul's prediction to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:29-30) was already coming to pass in Paul's own day (cf. 1 Tim 1:3) and continued in John's time (cf. 1 John). Likewise, the problem of hirelings continued in the church, as seen in Peter's exhortation to the elders to shepherd God's flock willingly and not just for money (1 Pet 5:2).

According to Barrett in *New Testament Theology*, the themes introduced in a general way (Jn 10:11-13) are then personalized and developed (10:14-18). Jesus' knowledge of his flock and their knowledge of him (v. 14) are compared to the knowledge the Father and the Son have of one another (v. 15). The conjunction translated “just as” *(kathos)* is most often used as a comparative, but it can have a causal sense (Barrett 674). Before revealing more about his death, Jesus mentions that he has other sheep not of this sheep pen who must be brought also, so *there shall be one flock and one shepherd* (v. 16). The most natural reading, accepted by most scholars, is that Jesus was referring to sheep from outside the fold of Judaism. There were Gentiles who would listen to his voice and be joined to his flock.

2.3 LEADERSHIP IN GENERAL

Some view leadership as a series of specific traits or characteristics. Others see it as comprised of certain skills and knowledge. And some think of leadership as a process. This view of leadership, as a process, places an emphasis on social interaction and relationship.

This is the idea that leadership is a type of relationship, one that typically includes influencing others in a certain direction (Wolinski 32). It is a complex relationship between people, based on trust, obligation, commitment, emotion, and a shared vision of the good.

There are different leadership theories that leaders adapt. These include: Behavioral Theory, Contingency Theory, Functional Theory, Great Man Theory, Path-Goal Theory, Servant Leadership Theory, Situational Theory, Trait Theory, Transactional Theory, and Transformational Theory.

According to Wolinski, the Behavioral Theory focuses especially on what highly effective leaders do. This theory is often preferred by educators because behaviours can rather easily be seen and duplicated. The major criticisms are that it does not help leaders know when to use certain behaviours and to share their motives for using those behaviours (71). The Contingency Theory on the other hand states that a leader's effectiveness is contingent on how well the leader's style matches a specific setting or situation. And how, you may ask, is this different from situational theory? In situational theory the focus is on adapting to the situation, whereas contingency states that effective leadership depends on the degree of fit between a leader's qualities and style and that of a specific situation or context (73).

The Functional Theory focuses especially on the behaviours needed to help a group to improve its effectiveness and achieve its goals. The theory identifies the specific functions needed by leadership for addressing certain situations (Gangel 59). On the other hand, the Great Man Theory focuses on the traits and actions of those who are considered to be great leaders, as if they were born with those traits of leadership, that leadership is a trait of those people, more than any skills that they had learned (60). Path Goal Theory deals with how leaders motivate followers to accomplish identified objectives. It postulates that effective

leaders have the ability to improve the motivation of followers by clarifying the paths and removing obstacles to high performance and desired objectives. The underlying beliefs of path-goal theory are that people will be more focused and motivated if they believe they are capable of high performance, believe their effort will result in desired outcomes, and believe their work is worthwhile (Kilinski 101).

The Servant Leadership Theory reflects a philosophy that leaders should be servants first. It suggests that leaders must place the needs of followers, customers, and the community ahead of their own interests in order to be effective. The idea of servant leadership has a significant amount of popularity within leadership circles – but it is difficult to describe it as a theory inasmuch as a set of beliefs and values that leaders are encouraged to embrace (103).

According to Wolinski, Situational Theory postulates that different situations require different styles of leadership. That is, to be effective in leadership requires the ability to adapt or adjust one's style to the circumstances of the situation. The primary factors that determine how to adapt are an assessment of the competence and commitment of a leader's followers. The assessment of these factors determines if a leader should use a more directive or supportive style (75). He further says that in the Skills Theory, that learned knowledge and acquired skills/abilities are significant factors in the practice of effective leadership. Skills theory by no means disavows the connection between inherited traits and the capacity to be an effective leader – it simply argues that learned skills, a developed style, and acquired knowledge, are the real keys to leadership performance. It is of course the belief that skills theory is true that warrants all the effort and resources devoted to leadership training and development (77).

Furthermore, the Trait Theory postulates that people are either born or not born with the qualities that predispose them to success in leadership roles. That is, that certain inherited qualities, such as personality and cognitive ability, are what underlie effective leadership. There have been hundreds of studies to determine the most important leadership traits, and while there is always going to be some disagreement, intelligence, sociability, and drive (aka determination) are consistently cited as key qualities (Schaller 161). The Transactional Theory of leadership on the other hand, focuses on the exchanges that take place between leaders and followers. It is based in the notion that a leader's job is to create structures that make it abundantly clear what is expected of his/her followers and also the consequences (i.e. rewards and punishments) for meeting or not meeting these expectations. This theory is often likened to the concept and practice of management and continues to be an extremely common component of many leadership models and organizational structures (Gangel 62).

Finally, the Transformational Theory states that leadership is the process by which a person engages with others and is able to create a connection that results in increased motivation and morality in both followers and leaders. It is often likened to the theory of charismatic leadership that espouses that leaders with certain qualities, such as confidence, extroversion, and clearly stated values, are best able to motivate followers. The key in transformational leadership is for the leader to be attentive to the needs and motives of followers in an attempt to help them reach their maximum potential. In addition, transformational leadership typically describes how leaders can initiate, develop, and implement important changes in an organization. This theory is often discussed in contrast with transactional leadership.

The root word for leadership is lead ('agw) which means 'to go, travel or guide'. We can see immediately that leadership involves a process or better put, a movement towards a

goal. The word also has its derivative from the Latin root word for leader, *ledere* that an initial understanding of leadership can be deduced. *Ledere* literally means 'to go before'. It means being an example, showing the way, taking risks and using initiative. There are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept. That is why for Munroe, "leadership is the capacity to influence others through inspiration motivated by a passion, generated by a vision, produced by a conviction, ignited by a purpose" (62).

Similarly, Elaigwu defines leadership as the responsibility of conducting a people or group of people towards the achievements of determined goals (246). Essential as these two definitions are, they lack the aspect of a common interest between the leader and the led. The missing link is established by Kapena who defines leadership as the relation between an individual and a group built around some common interest and behaving in a manner directed or determined by him (13). Leadership thus entails the ability of the leader to know himself, have a vision that is well understood by the led and taking actions that will achieve the determined objectives. According to Richard and Engel, "Leadership is about articulating visions, embodying values, and creating the environment within which things can be accomplished" (47).

According to Greenleaf, leadership is that process in which one person sets the purpose or direction for one or more other persons and gets them to move along together with him or her and with each other in that direction with competence and full commitment" (4). A leader takes people where they do not necessarily want to go, but ought to be. Leadership is a combination of strategy and character. If you must be without one, be without the strategy but the character is indispensable. "Leadership is being bold enough to have vision and humble enough to recognize achieving it will take the efforts of many people — people who are most fulfilled when they share their gifts and talents, rather than just work. Leaders

create that culture, serve that greater good and let others soar" (9).

Still further, leadership is therefore the capacity to set goals for the organization. In the words of Ihejiamaizu, “leadership involves some sharing of power or influence; but the leader is the one who is able to unite people in pursuit of the organization's goals” (102). According to the “Trait Theory” of leadership as seen above, the qualities of a good leader must include sound judgment, intelligence, knowledge, good perception of human nature, commonsense, a good level of training” dependability, sociability, economic status, self-confidence and ability to appraise situation correctly (Bratton and Walle 218). The question arises as to what extent have leaders in Nigeria been able to combine these traits to produce reasonable results in the conduct of public affairs in the country?

McCleskey, citing Bass and other authors, argues that the search for a single definition of leadership may be in vain since the correct definition of leadership depends on the interest of the researcher and the type of problem or situation being studied (79). Although difficult, it is important to have a good definition of leadership. It is one of the terms most widely used in many areas of human activity, including armed forces, business, politics, religion, sports, etc.

In this thesis, an effort is made to develop a definition that may satisfy different viewpoints and provide a better base for the study of leadership. Even if the researcher’s proposed definition ends up being one more of the many definitions that have been proposed, the process of elaborating the definition may contribute to a better understanding of the concept of leadership. Leadership as an evolving concept could be defined as “the process of interactive influence that occurs when, in a given context, people accept someone as their leader who has courageously demonstrated to have their love or good at heart and who is positively disposed to help the led to achieve common goals even at the risk of his life".

The researcher has couched and adopted the above definition because of its openness and propensity to fit in the discussion of the thesis topic "Interpreting the Good Shepherd in John 10:1-18 with a Focus on Leadership in Contemporary Nigeria". The heroic action of the Good Shepherd is propelled by love of the flock that he guards and courageously defends in the approach of those who come to steal and kill and to destroy. He does not act like the hireling who flees in the coming of the wolf and leaves the flock vulnerable. The demonstration of courage motivated by love of the flock should guide leaders in Nigeria to be able to lead as Jesus demonstrated.

A leader therefore is expected to demonstrate qualities, which embrace but not limited to good character, vision, tact, prudence, and ability to lead by example because people basically ascribe leadership to those who they feel can most enable them achieve important goals or objectives. Leadership is combination of strategy and character and of the two elements, character is the most preferred for leadership.

Could it be said that Nigerians that hitherto found themselves in positions of authority do not possess adequate leadership traits capable of addressing critical challenges facing the country? What are the factors responsible for poor leadership style among Nigeria's leaders?

2.4 LEADERSHIP IN NIGERIA

Leaders in Nigeria are aware of the general principles of good leadership as is practised in other parts of the world. Nigeria is richly endowed by providence with human and material resources critical for national development and advancement. However, since gaining political independence, Nigeria has continued to meander the path befitting failed, weak and "juvenile" states. A state that had very great prospects at independence and was touted to lead Africa out of the backwoods of underdevelopment and economic dependency, Nigeria is still stuck in the league of very poor, corrupt, underdeveloped, infrastructurally

decaying, crisis-riven, morally bankrupt and leadership-deficient countries (Asaju 43). Rather than become an exemplar for transformational leadership, modern bureaucracy, national development, national integration and innovation, Nigeria seems to be infamous for whatever is mediocre, corrupt, insanely violent and morally untoward (Mukaila 11).

Thus, one cannot but agree with the position that Nigeria is a victim of poor leadership and convoluted systemic corruption which has become pervasive and cancerous in the country's national life. This view has been held strongly in literature by scholars and writers who have identified the inexorable nexus between leadership crisis and corruption in the country as the continued reason for Nigeria's inglorious economic throes, political convolutions and national underdevelopment (Agbor 46, Ezirim 61 and Ogbunwezeh 43). In fact, Agbor argues that the success or failure of any society depends largely on the mannerism of its leadership. He adds that the result of poor leadership in Nigeria is embodied as poor governance manifested in consistent political crisis and insecurity, poverty of the extreme order among the citizens, debilitating miasma of corruption and rising unemployment indices (51). While not exclusive to Nigeria, Transparency International (IT) considers corruption to be one of the most chronic macroeconomic problems confronting most African countries today (12). It is seen as the root cause of the various economic and political crises that have plagued the African region, and continues to aggravate not only the problem of underdevelopment of each country, but also that of abject poverty of the citizenry. Although not a Nigerian phenomenon, the specter of corruption seems to haunt the nation and has permeated the entire fabric of state.

A greater part of Nigeria's problem can be summarized as leadership failure at the level of political leadership, specifically the president/presidency as one of the causes of the problems. While acknowledging the fact that the major part of the problem with Nigeria is squarely a failure of leadership and the unwillingness and the inability of our leaders to rise

up to their responsibility, and coupled with the challenge of personal exemplary leadership style, which are the hallmarks of true leadership (Mohammed 20) which has created a deficit of value-based leadership. It is arguable that a corrupt or bad society cannot produce honest and transparent leaders. Both past, current and even future leaders are product of the Nigerian society which was ranked 130 in 2010 and was pushed back to number 139 out of the 176 countries surveyed in 2012 by Transparency International Corruption perception index (IT 6).

Corruption strives where institutions are weak. Corruption strives where moral values are eroded by greed, sharp practices, selfishness and unbridled crave for luxuries and grandeur. Until the problem of leadership in Nigeria is unpacked, trite formulations are scrutinized objectively, and honest analysis are carried out, it would be difficult for an efficient and productive value enhancing institutions to flourish in Nigeria. It is fixable to toe the line. Agomuo pointed out that most of our public office holders are almost always ill-prepared but have manipulated their ways into high leadership positions through the already corrupt electoral process (34). Some others lament the accidental emergence of political leaders who are unprepared. Sometimes, unwilling individuals are forced on the nation.

There is no doubt that the selection process is marred with malpractices. Yet, the political institutions such as the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), the Judiciary and political parties are either weak or compromised, or both. In most matured and more democratic climes, leaders are chosen on the basis of ethical and nationalistic (patriotic pedigree. They must be made to pass through a rudiment of transparent selection process. They must have climbed the conventional and political or bureaucratic ladder which is deemed to have equipped them with the wealth of experience, qualities and competence required of a leader. In such democratic settings, election management body and the judiciary are meant to superintend over the process of producing the best or very close to the best political leaders (36). What happens rather is the pre-bendal politics where people are

rewarded in form of political patronage. Sometimes those rewarded may be unfit for the job. Leaders have abandoned the core values. For instance, when politicians give two hundred naira (N200), or five hundred naira (N500) or sachets of salt and maggi to the people during electioneering campaign, the electorates are quick to forget their sufferings in the last four years, and fail to think of how they would suffer in the next four years, thereby losing their values of integrity, selling their conscience cheaply and mortgaging their future lives and that of their children (Danladi 61).

Babalola asserts that as "as long as we keep having followership that demands patronage, handouts, and favours, our search for true leadership will be long and winding" (31). How can a society get a true leadership fix when people celebrate mediocrity and failed leaders? It is unfortunate that the endemic and dangerous value of corruption in Nigeria has eaten deep into almost every facet of our lives and establishments. In the past, religious leaders, teachers, lawyers and judges were the custodians of our core values of honesty, moral integrity and social justice (33). But the reverse is the case where the people who belong to these groups have not always demonstrated this in their lives.

Leadership failure in Nigeria can be viewed from the perspective of corruption and other related inadequacies on the part of political leaders. The following can be said to be components of leadership failure in Nigeria.

First, Corruption: Corruption is not peculiar to Nigeria, however, the cancerous menace has eaten enormously into the nation's fabrics to such an extent that pockets of corrupt practices have pervaded and watered down to even the smallest of structures at the grassroot level. Corruption has defied all possible or acclaimed attempts to dissolve and has become widespread and corrosive in the country (Mangu 24). The activities of the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) and Independent Corrupt Practices Commission have been reduced to charades and for getting back at opponents of the administration. The

countless reforms and lack of genuity and integrity of Nigerian leaders have left Nigeria corrupt as ever (Lawal and Owolabi 10).

Second, Lack of Foresight: The leadership of Nigeria lacks the ability to predict issues or outcomes. They thus are transformed to reactionary leaders who react only when a problem arises rather than foresee it coming and forestalling the occurrence. So they wait for a disaster to occur or an already depleting infrastructure to completely collapse before finding a remedy. The former United States ambassador to Nigeria, Walter Carrington, while delivering the 29th convocation lecture of University of Ilorin identified corruption, lack of good leadership and foresight as responsible for most of the economic problems confronting the country. He noted that persistent poverty retarded the growth of the country and blamed successive country leaders for lack of foresight and corruption as responsible for the decline growth of the giant of Africa (Mokuolu and Abubakre 28).

Third, False Hopes: Local leaders in Nigeria capitalize on the illiteracy and incapacitation of the locals and indoctrinate them with falsehood, claiming they have their religious and ethnic interest at heart when in reality they are the true enemies of their own people. It has become a normal act of governance to make shadowed promises without a will to perform. So year in-year out and as campaign seasons draw near, white elephant promises are made by those who claim to understand the needs of the people but hardly with an intention to fulfil them. This was also captured by Dunnamah who identified Africa and Nigeria's political position as backward, stemming from unfulfilled promises, greed and the likes (51).

Fourth, Lack of ideas, creativity and innovation: These are clearly evident in the attitude and charisma of Nigeria's leaders. In the growing insecurity of the nation and in the proper utilization of Nigeria's natural, capital and human resources, the leaders lack direction.

This was captured by Nnonyelu who described the situation as “the predilection of the Nigerian elite in the face of poverty of ideas” and was reiterated as a “failed, insensitive or clueless political leadership which is fighting hard to appease their constituents with crumbs from the national cake while stealing large chunks for self-preservation and perpetuation” (85).

Fifth, Poorly Baked Policies, Poor planning and lack of continuity: According to Arowolo, frequent policy somersaults give credence to the assertion that the Nigerian government lack what it takes to birth outstanding policies that will sail through to completion and goal attainment. With the frequent churning out of policies shrouded with inconsistency, faulty in their conception and 'directionless' in their context, it brings to wonder the elements that constitute the nation's governing body. “Good leadership includes the capacity to formulate and implement sound policies, and the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions” (20); but what Nigeria's experience is such that policies are not allowed to work when they are against perceived interests and when they are allowed to run, do not stand the test of time because of lack of direction.

Furthermore, is Irresponsibility: Leadership in Nigeria is grossly irresponsible, are not answerable to the electorates and not accountable to the masses. The privatization drive by the government of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo that privatized almost every key industry and service providing agency bring to mind the question, 'what then is the responsibility of the government to the people? If all basic amenity providing institutions of government are under private control, certainly the cost would rise and the quality reduce because the government possesses financial weight to run these organizations (Chigbu 31). Social laws of contract and regulations have been breached without censure. Where this state of affairs has become prevalent, the public service has lent itself to abuse by dishonest politicians. In his search for

the cause of the Nigerian problem, Chinua Achebe, lamented in his book 'The trouble with Nigeria' that the trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership. According to him, 'there is nothing basically wrong with the Nigerian character. There is nothing wrong with the Nigerian land, climate or water or air or anything else. The Nigerian problem is the unwillingness or inability of its leaders to rise to their responsibility, to the challenge of personal examples which are the hallmarks of true leadership (3).

In spite of the above is the, Lack of the rule of law: There is a dearth in the supremacy of the law. According to Nwekeaku, this lends its bearing from the fact that the judiciary which is an arm that upholds the rule of law is held by the jugular by political actors (61). He averred that Nigeria's constitution provides for the fundamental rights of the citizens and roles for every level of government, thus it is not the lack of good laws that troubles Nigeria but the lack of good governance that seeks to twist these laws to its own curves. Highlighting this further, Lawal and Owolabi opined that the rule of law is undermined by the lack of independence of the judiciary in Nigeria. This is evident in the direct influence Nigeria's political leaders have over the judiciary (in appointments, promotions, threats and gifts), their adjudications and the weakness of the judicial machinery to enforce the law and judicial decisions (112).

Eighth, Lack of Competence and ill-preparedness: Leadership in Nigeria has been seen as an ambition in order to cut some 'national cake' and not for the sake of good leadership and governance as it were. Little wonder that the emerging leaders would exhibit lack of direction at the assumption of office and are known to be incompetent in resolving issues and driving development. Most of them saw the status as a prize to win and cared less about the details of the job to perform and suddenly found themselves face-to-face with responsibilities they were unprepared and ill equipped to handle. Consequently, leadership

incompetence and bad governance are not far-fetched causes of poverty among the mass of Nigerians which is also evident in the government's inability to wisely and discretely employ the country's petroleum and other resources (Omoyibo 201). This contradicts the tenets of good leadership which is captured by Adeosun as “competent management of a country’s resources or affairs in a manner that is open, transparent, accountable, equitable and responsive to the yearning and aspirations of the people” (3). The truth is that our leaders have, in large measure, failed us. Not only have they failed to promote economic development to improve the living conditions of the people in general but they have also done everything to undermine all laid down rules and regulations that guide socio-economic and political development (Ihonvbere 29).

Ninth, Oppression, Suppression and Intimidation: The military regimes had been identified to use the medium of intimidation and oppression to enforce obedience and cooperation from citizens, government bodies and organizations at all levels (Osumah and Ikelegbe 65). It is thus an aberration when a much sought civilian/democratic leadership uses same medium in governance. According to Osumah and Ikelegbe, Party discipline evaporates as cliques, pursuing narrow and shallow agendas appropriate state power and use it to settle old scores, intimidate the opposition and steal public resources (188). These are used as tools of enforcing their wills and caprices on opponents and the masses. The law enforcement agencies and units of control like the Police, Economic and Financial Crimes Commission, (EFCC), Independent and Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC), State Security Service (SSS), Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and hired thugs are unfortunately, used to carry out these horrendous acts as they have become increasingly authoritarian and unruly. This intimidation and oppression is also very evident during elections which are turned into a 'do-or-die' affair by desperate incumbents and various party loyalists. The quest

to sit-tight in office has turned governance in Nigeria to an animalistic venture for the one that wields the stick the most fiercely (Osumah and Ikelegbe 131).

Tenth, the use of Political Offices as 'Objects for Settlement': Clientelism and 'settlement' dispositions towards political and public offices whereby these esteemed offices requiring technocrats and professionals are used to pay back favours, has grossly affected productivity of the various sectors of the nation. Ubochi and Benedict highlighted this by expounding the 1999 Obasanjo-led administrative period that, “Leadership was devalued; people of questionable character and preference were selected to governance. They were elevated and forced on the people through vicious means of intimidation, thuggery and electoral rigging” (39).

Eleventh, Lack of Accountability, Transparency and Due Process: This is closely linked to corruption. Governance at national, state and local levels are neither accountable nor transparent, while due process is boycotted. The various public sectors are shrouded in weak structures and poverty while lots of money are allotted to them in the budget. This is an offshoot of a non-transparent governance by those in authority (Julius-Adeoye 55).

Twelfth, Lack of Patriotism and Nationalistic Consciousness: Here, self-interest overrides national interest, individualism against nationalism. The drive and push of leaders seek to amass as much properties and assets as possible and lip-service declarations for national development. This position is succinctly captured by Nnablife and Ugochukwu (81) who stated that these leaders “accumulate wealth at the expense of national development without deference to the basic needs of the masses”. Further reiterating this assertion is the position of Idada who described governance in Nigeria as “politics of personality” (78).

The components of leadership failure discussed have characterized leadership in Nigeria. In the context of this work, the way out of this leadership quagmire is emulate the model of the Good Shepherd who is selfless and does everything to protect the sheep and sacrifice for their well-being.

2.5. THE NOBLE DEATH IN GREEK TRADITION

The essence of this section is to provide a basis to the disposition of the shepherd by his readiness to lay down his life for the sheep as contained in some section of the Good Shepherd Discourse. The concept of 'Noble Death' can be rightly traced to the ancient Greek tradition. A death could be recognized as noble or excellent, and so worthy of public praise. This Greek noble death basis will help throw more light on our understanding of the Johannine concept of the death of the Good Shepherd. The argument that the shepherd dies a 'noble death' may be linked to the Greek tradition. According to Lattimore in his book, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, the author establishes that the concept truly existed in the culture of ancient Greece in Athenian funeral orations celebrating the 'noble death' of the city's fallen soldiers and how to draw praise from death (237).

Although the ancients praised success and victory above all, the hard experiences of a military society required that suitable honour be paid to those who died in battle for their city. Extant Athenian funeral orations provide ample data about the expression "noble death" (238). It may be considered "easy," "good," "noble" or "famous"; a life might "end well". Anecdotes about the deaths of public figures mention that so-and-so died a (i) "good death" (ευθανασια). (ii) Noble or Famous Death. More commonly ancient authors qualified the verb "to die" with an adverb such as "nobly" or "honourably," often indicating why they judged a particular death "noble." For example, Socrates urges soldiers faced with battle to act nobly, even if this means death,

> Strive by all means to live in security, but if ever it falls to your lot to face the

> dangers of battle, seek to preserve your life, but with honour and not with disgrace; for death is the sentence of all mankind, but to die nobly is the special honour which nature has reserved for the good (143).

His perspective is that of a military society in which courage to fight and die brings honour; in contrast, other actions are shameful, such as cowardly flight. The battle, moreover, was fought in defense of Athens, and so benefitted the city's inhabitants. At stake, then, are the issues of honour (and shame), which are being publicly reinforced by this funeral oration (Plato 211). Socrates once more provides an example of the third term being examined. According to him, “For we shall find that men of ambition and greatness of soul not only are desirous of praise for such things, but prefer a glorious death to life, zealously seeking glory rather than existence” (212).

This sparkles with terms celebrated in the rhetoric of praise and blame: those who "die nobly" are "lovers of honour" (φιλοτιμοι) and "great souled" (μεγαλοψυχοι); they seek "glory," which can be found even in death (44). In general, then, Greek orators described as "noble" the death of soldiers in which courage was contrasted with cowardice and where death was declared honourable but flight shameful.

Orators also labeled a death noble by declaring that it "ended well" (κ α λ ω ς τελευταν). Herodotus, for example, frequently spoke of warriors ending their lives well in combat or choosing battle rather than flight. He recorded how Croesus asked Solon if he knew of someone truly blest. Solon told him of a certain Tellus of Athens, whose crowning blessing was to die a noble death,

> He crowned his life with a most glorious death: for in a battle between the Athenians and their neighbours at Eleusis, he attacked and routed the enemy and most nobly died, and the Athenians gave him public burial where he fell and paid him great

honour (Loraux 312).

He "ended" his life in a superlative manner ("most glorious," "most nobly"), that is, as a warrior in the city's army where military prowess translated into honour and praise. His manly courage, moreover, benefitted Athens and led to posthumous honours, such as "public burial" and special forms of praise (great honour).

This sample of terms for "noble death" yields some important points. First, there was a popular understanding of a heroic or noble death. Second, the context in which death was called "noble" was generally a military one in which Athens' soldiers died in her defense. Third, the calculus of honour and shame (i.e., fight versus flight and death versus life) motivated heroes to die nobly; thus, honour was their paramount motive and reward. Fourth, comparisons were frequently made: (a) manly courage vs cowardice, (b) fight versus flight and (c) praise and glory versus disgrace and shame. Fifth, deaths were noble because they benefitted others, generally Athens. Sixth, noble deaths were celebrated with posthumous honours: graves built at public expense, annual commemorations in funeral speeches, fame in history and legend (311).

2.5.1 Funeral Orations and Noble Death

The ancients quibbled over who invented the funeral speech, the Greeks or the Romans (518). But the overwhelming evidence from antiquity about the funeral speech (επιταφιος λογος) comes from Greek orators living between 450-300 B.C.E. who delivered annual orations to honour the dead of Athens' various wars (151). These authors explicitly state that the task of a funeral oration is to "praise the dead" and to declare an encomium for their lives. Funeral orations, then, share the same formal aim as epideictic rhetoric, that is, honour and praise, the pivotal value of the ancient world (305).

All of the extant examples of Athenian funeral orations closely followed a regular pattern of topics that were the sources of praise, each of which was developed in a

remarkably similar manner. The researcher mentions this only to underscore the fact that praise and honor were pivotal values already in the times of Thucydides, Plato and Demosthenes, as well as in those of Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius. Moreover, the content of praise was even then remarkably constant, as evidenced by the stereotyped manner in which conventional sources of honour are developed. Men are praised for their *ascribed honour*: (1) origin in the land of Greece and descent from ancient and noble ancestors, and (2) nurture, education and training in the value codes of Athens. They were praised moreover for their *achieved honour*: (1) excellence of body, soul and fortune. (2) they might, moreover, be compared to famous heroes. This same sequence of topics and their contents was eventually codified in the encomium genre found in progymnastic literature. Thus, the conventionality of the criteria for honour and praise remained constant for many centuries, including the common appreciation of what constituted a noble death (306).

Just as orators structured their funeral orations according to commonplace topics from a shared sense of what constituted a praiseworthy life, so also, they praised the death of military heroes according to a common set of canons for a noble death. The orators stressed how the death of Athens' soldiers benefitted the city. Hyperides, for example, regularly touted the gift of freedom given Athens and Greece by its fallen soldiers: "Their courage in arms. . .reveals them as the authors of many benefits conferred upon their country and the rest of Greece" (112). Later he says that these soldiers "sacrificed their lives that others might live well". Similar remarks were made by Thucydides, Plato and Demosthenes. Indeed, many of those who fell in defense of Athens were called "saviours" (215).

In a variation of the motif of benefit to others, orators argued that Athens' fallen heroes displayed exceptional justice toward the *polis* by their deaths. According to the ancients, justice was one of the four cardinal virtues, the one according to which duties were paid. Aristotle said: "To righteousness (δικαιοσυνη) it belongs to be ready to distribute

according to desert, and to preserve ancestral customs and institutions and the established laws. . .and to keep agreements" (220). To whom does one owe anything? "First among the claims of righteousness are our duties to the gods, then our duties to the spirits, then those to country and parents, then those to the departed" (Aristotle 14). The premier aspect of justice celebrated in the annual memorial for Athens' fallen soldiers was the duty they paid to the *polis* and its institutions. For example, many orators rehearsed the history of Athens, in particular its struggles to be free of tyranny and its willingness to fight to preserve the ancestral way of life. The fallen who died were duty-bound to be faithful to that political history at the cost of their lives. Demosthenes summarizes this succinctly, "The considerations that actuated these men one and all to choose to die nobly have now been enumerated: birth, education, habituation to high standards of conduct, and the underlying principles of our form of government in general" (312). Their death, then, was noble not only because it benefitted polis and family, but because it demonstrated the virtue of justice as completely as possible. Since this material will be very important in our consideration of the Johannine shepherd, let us read another sample passage from Lysias.

> Now in many ways it was natural to our ancestors. . .to fight the battles of justice: for the very beginning of their life was just. . .They were the first and only people in that time to drive out the ruling classes. . . and establish a democracy; by sharing with each other the hopes of their perils they had freedom of soul in their civic life. For they deemed that it was the way of wild beasts to be held subject to one another by force, but the duty of men to delimit justice by law, to convince by reason, and to serve these two in act by submitting to the sovereignty of law and the instruction of reason (19).

Lysias indicated that current citizens were heirs of a political system based on justice and were accustomed to "fight the battles of justice." And it was their duty to protect this legacy.

Hence this defense of fatherland even at the cost of one's life most fully exemplified justice for them.

Athens reveled in its political freedom and despised the world of slaves and the rule of tyrants. Its orators expressed this civic value in another criterion for a noble death, that is, its voluntary character. The fallen soldiers were often said to "prefer noble death to a life of servitude" or to "choose" their death. This tradition of a voluntary death was found already in Plato's *Menexenus*, where the speaker's remarks contained most of the conventions of a noble death voluntarily undergone. Thus, those who perished in battle were not victims whose fate was decided by others, but courageous soldiers who took fate in their own hands (George 81).

On occasion orators declared that, although a warrior died in battle, he died a noble death. In the logic of honour and glory, he could be said to be "undefeated" or to have "conquered" his foe by his dying. For example, Leocrates writes of the war dead:

> Unconquered, they fell in the defense of freedom, and if I may use a paradox, they triumphed in their death. . .neither can we say that they have been defeated whose spirits did not flinch at the aggressor's threat. . .since by the choosing of a noble death they are escaping slavery (Leocrates 49).

We hear in Lycurgus' speech the cultural horror of death, which means weakness, loss of control and finally "slavery," a shameful status. But a military death, in which manly courage was displayed ("did not flinch") and which was endured for the benefit of Athens ("defense of freedom"), meant that in the world of honour and shame the fallen had "triumphed" and "have not been defeated" (Demosthenes 60). Thus, this small excerpt from Lycurgus contains almost the complete inventory of reasons why a death was called "noble" (63).

On occasion funeral orations declared a death "noble" because of some uniqueness. Orators assert that "no one" else has ever been able to perform this deed and achieve this

honour. In his funeral oration Hyperides articulated the uniqueness of those he praised in this manner: “Never before did men strive for a nobler cause, either against stronger adversaries or with fewer friends, convinced that valour gave strength and courage superiority as no mere numbers could” (19). Uniqueness was argued in two ways. First, no one before them had a more noble cause for which to fight. Second, a series of comparisons dramatized their excellence: they faced a foe stronger than had ever been faced and they advanced with fewer allies than anyone else.

According to Seeley, a truly noble death was generally identified as such by the posthumous honours paid to the deceased. This esteem might be expressed by public celebration of the dead, such as games or monuments. The very funeral orations which we are examining themselves serve to give glory to the dead first by giving a public evaluation of their worth and later by annual burnishing of their reputation (53). Whether games, monuments, or annual funeral orations, the aim was to give a type of eternal glory to the dead. Hence, we frequently find the claim that those being celebrated were in one sense like the gods, because their glory too was now deathless and everlasting. Demosthenes sums it up tidily, “It is a proud privilege to behold them possessors of deathless honours and a memorial of their valour erected by the State, and deemed deserving of sacrifices and games for all future time” (36).

Immortality on occasion was said to be the aim and result of a noble death. The common meaning of this point typically found expression in terms of the undying and immortal fame that was attached to the hero and his exploits.

This survey of extant Athenian funeral orations yields the following points. First, their formal aim was praise and honour of the fallen. Thus, the various meanings of "noble death" must be understood in light of this pivotal value. Second, noteworthy also was the utter conventionality of the topics from which praise was drawn. Third seven criteria for a noble

death emerged from the speeches: a death was noble which (a) benefitted others, (b) displayed justice to the fatherland, (c) was voluntarily accepted, (d) proved that the fallen died unvanquished and undefeated, (e) was a unique death, (f) produced posthumous honours, and (g) led to immortal fame and glory.

2.5.2 Noble Death in the Light of Literature of Israel

Did the Greek tradition of noble death become part of the rhetorical world of Israelite literature written in Greek? (Seeley 84). Did Jerusalem learn anything from Athens besides its alphabet? The books of Maccabees indicate that, in addition to the Greek language, Israel also adopted the cultural world of honour and shame and the tradition of praising a noble death for many of the same reasons as did the Greeks (Henten 140).

In general, 1 and 2 Maccabees illustrate the presence of the Greco-Roman understanding of a noble death in both their terminology and logic. The Maccabean literature frequently spoke of "dying nobly" (γενναιως απευθανατιζειν) (1 Macc. 4:35, 2 Macc. 6:28), or "ending nobly" (γενναιως τελευταν) (2 Macc. 7:5). Death might also be "glorious" (αιοδιμον θανατον) or "honourable" (μακαριον θανατον) (141). They cite the same reasons as Greek rhetoric for declaring a death "noble." Death was noble if it benefitted the nation or was suffered on its behalf or saves it (141). For example, Eleazar, called Aravan, charged an elephant he thought was carrying the king and speared it; unfortunately, the king was not aboard and the elephant crushed him as it fell. Nevertheless, the author said of him "So he gave up his life to save his people and to win for himself an everlasting name" (1 Macc 6:43-44) (142).

The voluntary character of a noble death was expressed in several ways (Seeley, 63).

It may be formally stated that the dying person chose or accepted death or willingly went to it. In regard to Eleazar's death, the author of 2 Maccabees twice stated that "he welcoming death with honour rather than a life with pollutions, went to the rack of his own accord (αυθαιρετως)" (2 Macc 6:19); shortly he recorded Eleazar saying, "I will leave to the young a noble example of how to die a good death nobly and willingly" (2 Macc 6:28) (Henten 142). The alternate expression of the voluntary character of a noble death consisted of the calculus made by the dying person that noble death is preferable to a shameful escape. Consider 1 Maccabees: "It is better for us to die in battle than to see the misfortunes of our nation and of the sanctuary" (3:59; see 2 Macc 6:19) (144).

Dying unconquered or conquering in death is found abundantly in 2 Maccabees. Of the martyrs the author says, "By their endurance they conquered the tyrant" (1:11). Eleazar won a victory over his torturers: "Although his sacred life was consumed by tortures and racks, he conquered the besiegers with the shield of his devout reason" (7:4) (145).

The manner of death conformed to the canons of honour accepted by the audience and so elicited from both observers and hearers the essence of honour: acknowledgment, glory, fame, honour, an everlasting name, renown and the like. For example, 1 Maccabees says of Eleazar, "So he gave his life to save his people and to win for himself an everlasting name" (6:44). Similarly, when Judas faced the enemy he remarked: "If our time has come let us die bravely for our kindred and leave no cause to question our honour" (9:10) Thus both Eleazar and Judas were credited with noble motives for dying, namely, benefit to others ("save his people" and "for our kindred") and quest for immortal honour ("everlasting name" and "unquestionable honour").

Noble deaths regularly contained mention of the virtue of those who died, both their courage and justice. Courage, the manly virtue of endurance of hardships, is often claimed both on behalf of the characters in the Maccabean literature. For example, Judas exhorted his

army before battle with the remark, "If our time has come, let us die bravely (εν ανδρεια) for our kindred" (1 Macc 9:10). Similarly, Eleazar eulogized the Israelite law by claiming that "it trains us in courage (ανδρειαν) so that we endure any suffering willingly" (2 Macc 5:23). But justice emerges as the paramount virtue which warrants our praise of Eleazar and the seven sons (Henten 146). Inasmuch as justice refers to one's duty to God, family/fatherland, and ancestors, the story about the old man and the seven brothers regularly calls attention to the fact that they died explicitly in fulfilment of their duty to one of the three figures mentioned above. One author acknowledges the duty shown to God by death as evidence of the virtue of justice: "They by nobly dying fulfilled their service to God" (2 Macc 12:14).

Readers regularly heard in this literature that the martyrs' deaths were noble because they were endured for the sake of ancestral laws. Eleazar boasted that he will leave a noble example to others of how to die a good death "willingly and nobly for the revered and holy laws" (2 Macc 6:28). This refers of course to God, the author of the laws, but also to the fatherland or *ethnos*, which collectively keeps those laws rather than Greek ones. Judas' exhortation made his army ready "to die for their laws and their country" (2 Macc 8:21). Finally, the Maccabean heroes fulfilled their duty toward their kin: "Let us bravely die for our kindred" (1 Macc 9:10). All of the Maccabean literature, therefore, acknowledged two virtues in particular as constitutive of a noble death: first, courage to die a painful death and second, justice or loyalty to God, the laws of the ethnos, the ethnos itself and one's kindred (Henten 270).

The Maccabean literature argued that not only did many Israelites know the Greek language (since the works were composed in Greek for a Greek-speaking Israelite audience), but that their authors learned as well the Greco-Roman canons of honour which earn public praise. The same criteria in Greek rhetoric for labeling a death "noble" occured in Israelite literature as well (Ashton 328). As we turn to John 10, we are aware that Greek-speaking

audiences were quite likely to know and appreciate the value code of the dominant culture. What now of the death of the "noble shepherd?"

2.5.3 The Death of the 'Good' Noble Shepherd

We examine now the death of Jesus, which was informed by the culture, and rhetoric of "noble death," as investigated above. We focus on John 10:11-18. Because of the rich tradition about a "noble" death in the rhetoric of praise, we argue that the adjective qualifying the "shepherd" should also be translated as "noble" (καλος) and not simply "good" (αγαθος). The author immediately tells us that the shepherd is labeled "noble" because of his death that benefits the flock: "the 'noble' shepherd lays down his life for his sheep." We observed above that orators most frequently declared the death of fallen soldiers noble because it benefitted the *polis*. The same reason is cited here to specify why and how the shepherd is honourable, namely, he benefits his flock by laying down his life on their behalf (Neyrey 73).

The Greek orator praised the soldiers who died in Athens' defense, and he cited the fact that they "died in battle for her" as the clearest proof of their benefaction to the homeland. John cites the same behaviour of Jesus-the-shepherd ("lay down his life for his flock") as most beneficial to the flock and as the grounds for praise of the shepherd ("the noble shepherd"). The rhetoric of praise, especially that found in funeral orations, provides an adequate background to interpret culturally John's honour claim for the shepherd. There is no question but that the qualifying remark, "lay down his life," refers to death (Brown 386). Brown further asserts that the shepherd's selfless disposition is a display of the great character and will.

Part of the argument that the shepherd is "noble" consists in the typical comparison found in funeral orations between heroes and cowards. In John, if the "noble" shepherd lays down his life for his sheep, by comparison the "hireling" flees when the wolf attacks. Like comparisons in the rhetoric of praise, two options are compared: (1) manly courage versus

cowardice, (2) flight versus fight, (3) death versus life, and finally (4) honour/glory versus shame/disgrace. In this light we read the contrast between the hireling and the noble shepherd as follows. The noble shepherd displays courage, decides to fight the enemy and thus dies for the flock. Therefore, he receives the acknowledgment of being "noble" for his honourable deeds. In comparison, the hireling cowardly flees from the conflict; by choosing to save his life he earns only contempt and disgrace (387). We argue that any audience in the world of the fourth evangelist would understand the implication of "courage" and "cowardice" in this comparison and thus honour the virtuous deed and cast shame on its opposite.

It is sometimes argued that the wolf stands for Satan or the Ruler of the World (Kovacs, 20). If accurate, we recall that in Hermogenes' rules for an encomium, he prescribed that honour may be drawn "from the one who slew him, as that Achilles died at the hands of the god Apollo" (Baldwin 32). According to Harold Attridge, the cosmic identification of Jesus' foe as "Ruler of the World," then, serves as grounds for even greater praise of Jesus for he dies fighting the ultimate foe (Attridge, 92). Similarly, the scene where the Jerusalem elite gathered in counsel to destroy Jesus leads to the same conclusion: the elites of Israel rallied together to kill him, a Galilean peasant. They may not be a "noble" foe, but their collective, powerful action against Jesus elevates their conflict between them and Jesus.

In 10:14 the shepherd is once again declared "noble" because he "knows his own" [sheep]. We suggest that this phrase describes Jesus' just duty to his own, and so is an act of virtue. "Knowing" did not surface as a criterion for a noble death in the rhetoric of praise. But it was there in another guise. All "virtuous" actions are noble and worthy of praise, especially courage and justice. A prominent virtue of Athens' soldiers who fell in combat is courage (ανδρεια), (Menexenus 237) which we saw credited to Jesus in the comparison of shepherd with hireling. The shepherd, however, displays another mark of nobility, the virtue of justice (δικαιοσυνη). Representing a long tradition, one progymnastic writer defined justice as the

virtue whereby people honour their basic obligations. "The parts of justice (δικαιοσυνη) are piety, fair dealing, and reverence: piety toward the gods, fair dealing towards men, reverence toward the departed" (Oscar 311).

We suggest that in 10:11-18 the evangelist has two aspects of justice in view: piety to God and fair dealing toward the disciples/sheep (Ashton 328). Beginning with the latter, we note that the hireling has no duty to the sheep; they are not his, but belong to another. In no way is he obliged in justice to face the wolf on their behalf; the owner should, but not the hireling. In contrast, the shepherd proclaims that he "knows his sheep," that is, he owns them as his own and assumes responsibility for them. His sheep, moreover, "know" him, thus assuring the reader that duties are understood on both sides. "Knowing" has the sense of acknowledging, owning, feeling responsibility toward (Brown 514). The sheep show their relationship to the shepherd by the fact that they "hear his voice, he calls them by name . . .and the sheep follow him because they know his voice" (10:3-4). The duty in justice which the shepherd owes the sheep is then expressed in the declaration that "I lay down my life for my sheep" (10:15). Thus, when Jesus the shepherd said that "I know mine and mine know me" (10:14), he declares his loyalty to the sheep and thus acknowledges his duty in justice to "his own."

The justice of the shepherd points in another direction, piety or to Jesus' Father who is God. Paralleling the remark made about the reciprocal "knowing" between shepherd and sheep, Jesus declares a similar relationship with the Father: "the Father knows me and I know the Father" (10:15). In addition to what we learned about "knowing" above, we are reminded of Bultmann's remark about the verb "to know," namely, that one of its basic meanings is "acknowledgment," as when the scriptures talk about "knowing God" or "knowing God's name" (Bultmann 698). Although "to know" forms an important part of the way John's gospel distinguishes insiders from outsiders and ranks those within in terms of what they know, this

other meaning of "to know" has to do with social relationships which entail reciprocal duties. Some form no relationship with Jesus: they do not know him (1:10; 16:3; 17:25), whereas God, Jesus and his disciples "know" each other and so indicate intimate levels of loyalty and commitment (6:69; 10:38; 13:31; 17:3, 23). All of this aid in our appreciation of 10:15 as expressing a relationship in which duties are fulfilled, God and Jesus as well as Jesus and his disciples. This encodes what was meant by the virtue of justice. Thus, two virtues, justice and courage, mark the behaviour of the shepherd, just as they did for Athens' soldiers who died noble deaths. These virtues, moreover, are articulated in the context of the death of the noble shepherd, thus giving further warrant to the "noble" shepherd's death.

In 10:16 Jesus states that he has "other sheep, not of this fold" and so there will be "one flock and one shepherd." This remark, too, becomes more accessible when seen in terms of "noble death." First, it surely benefits the sheep to be safely gathered into one, that is, into close association with the shepherd, who can pasture and protect them all. This represents another example of the duty of the shepherd, that is, his virtue of justice toward the sheep. Second, when or how is this achieved? Comparable remarks in 11:52; 12:23-24, and 32 indicate that Jesus' death occasions these benefits. Caiaphas' prophecy, we are told, really meant "that Jesus would die . . . not for the nation only, but to gather into one the scattered children of God" (11:52). Jesus' death, then, benefits the sheep currently around him and those "scattered." Similarly, in his exhortation to the Greeks whom Philip and Andrew brought to him, Jesus declares that when a seed dies and falls into the ground, it bears much fruit (12:23-24). Finally, in an unmistakable reference to his death Jesus says: "When I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw all to myself" (12:32). His death ("lifted up") benefits others by "drawing all to myself." Thus 10:16, especially when seen in relationship to similar remarks in chs 10-12, bears the reading of "noble" death because of benefits rendered and the display of the virtue of justice (Schnackenburg 299).

The Father's relationship to Jesus is further developed when we are told, "For this reason my Father loves me, because I lay down my life in order to take it up again" (10:17). According to John Pilch, examining this in the light of the rhetoric of noble death, we know that "love" was considered a part of justice in antiquity. Although modern commentators have tended to interpret this verse in light of romantic attachment, in the cultural world of the New Testament love basically referred to group bonds or group glue that held persons together, especially kinship groups (Pilch 127). The Father's "love" contains a strong element of approval, which suggests the pride of the Father in Jesus. Obedient sons, moreover, show justice to their fathers and so honour them. The reason for this "love" is the complex statement that Jesus both lays down his life and takes it back. We have already seen that a noble death warrants praise and honour, which should enlighten our understanding of "lay down my life" in this context. But the second part, "in order that I may take it again," seems utterly obscure and has no parallel in funeral oratory. No one in the history of humankind has ever come back from the dead. In fact, we are called "mortals," i.e., those who die, to distinguish our status from that of God or the gods who are the "immortals." Is Jesus crossing a boundary line here? For a mere mortal to claim such would be ludicrous, and thus shameful (cf. John 8:52, 56-58). In fact, such a claim would violate justice for it would be blasphemy toward God, not piety (cf. 10:33) (128). How are Jesus' remarks just and so honourable? Jesus claims authorization from God for his speech and actions: "I have received this command from my Father" (10:18). A son who obeys his father honours him; he fulfills the basic justice which offspring owe their parents.

Looking more closely at 10:17-18, we recall how in epideictic rhetoric a death was labeled "noble" because it was voluntary. Both vv 17 and 18 affirm the voluntary nature of Jesus' death. For the third and fourth times, Jesus states that he lays down his own life (Barrett 374).

10:11 The good shepherd “lays down his life for his sheep”.

10:15 “I lay down my life for my sheep”

10:17 The Father loves me because “I lay down my life”

10:18 I have power “to lay it down”

He may well declare that his death is God's will or that he goes as it was written of him and other such remarks. But the substance is the same: he chooses, he agrees, he "lays down his life willingly" (απ εμαυτου) (375).

But 10:17-18 states more, for Jesus proudly declares "No one takes it from me." We saw that Jesus confronts a very powerful foe. But this foe has no power over Jesus (14:30); in fact, as Jesus faces his death, he declares "I have overcome the world" (16:33). Thus, the remarks in 10:17-18 assert two things: first, Jesus is no victim; he is not mastered by anyone (Orchard 161). Second, the cause of Jesus' death lies entirely in his own hands both to "lay it down" and "take it up." Thus, it would be fair to say that he dies unvanquished and unconquered, which are marks of a noble death.

Finally, Jesus claims "power" (εξουσια) to lay down his life and to take it back. In light of the rhetoric of a noble death, the first half of this expresses that his death is voluntary, namely, "I lay it down." Voluntary deaths are always "noble." The claim to have "power," moreover, belongs to the world of praise and honour. People with "power" are, as we say, movers and shakers. They control their own destiny; they accomplish what they set out to do. This suggests, then, that Jesus stands very high on the scale of people who do difficult deeds and who are masters of their fate. Whence comes this power? "I have received this command (εντολη) from my Father" (v 18b). At the very least, v 18 states that it is God's will that Jesus lay down his life, thus referring to his "obedient death” (Brown 398). Hence Jesus claims to be fulfilling the dutiful relationship between himself and the Father, a virtuous or

just thing to do.

According to Jerome Neyrey in his book, *An Ideology of Revolt: John's Christology in Social Science Perspective*, the claim to have power "to take it [my life] again" does not register with anything in the Hebrew Bible or the Greek rhetoric of praise. This is nothing else but a claim to be equal to God, that is, to have one of the exclusive powers of God (Neyrey 59). Jesus claims that even though he dies ("I lay down my life"), he will conquer the last enemy ("I take it back again"). This remark is but a claim until evidence is provided. But as a claim, it lays hold of the greatest power in the cosmos of which humans could conceive. If the claim is true, then great honour should be accorded Jesus, for he has what no one else (except God) has. Thus, his death is noble for three reasons: (a) he claims the greatest of all powers, namely, to conquer death and (b) his empowerment is unique: no one but his donor has or will have this power and (c) his death is voluntary and he dies unconquered. The followings points are parity points in reference to the death of Jesus.

1. Death benefitted others, especially fellow citizens.
2. Comparison between courage/cowardice, fight/ flight, death/life, honor/shame
3. Manly courage displayed by soldiers who fight and die
4. Deeds and death unique
5. Voluntary death is praised
6. Unconquered in death; victory in dying nobly
7. Justice and noble death: soldiers uphold the honor of their families and serve the interests of the justice

The presence of so many and such important motifs in one Johannine passage warrants comment. First, we trust that the similarities noted in the postulations are correct. This amplification of the nobility of certain kinds of death is regularly found scattered throughout Greek rhetorical theory and praxis, but is clustered in John 10:11-18. This

amplification of praise suggests that one of the formal strategies in the telling of John 10 is to claim and demonstrate the nobleness of Jesus precisely by his death (Brown 112).

2.5.4 Shepherds in the Ancient Near East (ANE)

According to Jack W. Vancil, in the Ancient Near East (ANE), where Palestine belonged, shepherding was considered one of the oldest of human occupations (1187). Cows, sheep and goats, including horses, asses, and camels were considered the herd animals in Palestine and the other Near Eastern societies. But the principal animal, owing to its size, abundance, and usefulness, was the sheep (Mattingly 945). It is no wonder, then, that the shepherd imagery "was used in a figurative way throughout the Ancient Near East and in the Hellenistic world. It is therefore, quite natural that the Old Testament and New Testament should also use the shepherd imagery" (942).

Ancient Near East refers to places like ―Mesopotamia, including the modern country of Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Lebanon, Israel, Palestine and Iran. This is what we call today, "Middle East." In the ANE shepherding was considered not only as a human occupation, but also the economic foundation of these societies. Nomadic peoples (e.g., Amalekites and Midianites) were shepherds. Sheep provided for the ancient peoples meat, milk, fat, wool, skins, and horns. The economic importance of sheep, besides its being sacrificial animal, cannot be underestimated. Thus, as Timothy Laniak affirms, "Everyone who lived in the ancient Near East would have either lived in a household that owned flocks or seen shepherds who led their sheep to graze along the edges of settled areas" (109).

While shepherds were predominantly men, it is an occupation not exclusively for them. It is said that among the Bedouin (desert-dwelling Arabian ethnic groups of the Middle Eastern deserts), a young girl of eight to ten years of age began herding as a trainee, and

continued to herd until fifteen or sixteen by which time she would usually be married and begin housekeeping and childrearing (Borowski 48). This can likewise be seen in the Old Testament stories about Rebecca, Rachel and Leah, and Jethro's daughters.

The shepherds herding the flock may not necessarily be owners of the flock. They could simply be hired by the herd owner (e.g., Gen 29-30 where Jacob was hired by Laban to pasture the sheep). It could happen that those hired to care for herds did not always care for them as an owner would (Aberbach 226). Thus, we have the distinction between the good shepherd and the bad shepherd. Shepherding could be a dangerous and demanding occupation. Shepherds were always on the lookout for predators in the form of both wild animals and human thieves. Since sheep were easy prey for wild animals, shepherds had to constantly care and keep watch on their herds (see 1 Sam 17:34-35). Because of the dangers one had to face, hired shepherds sometimes chose to save their own skins rather than risk themselves for their flocks (Carnes 21). We find in the Gospel of John an example of this: "The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep. The hired hand, who is not the shepherd and does not own the sheep, sees the wolf coming and leaves and runs away – and the wolf snatches them and scatters them. The hired hand runs away because a hired man does not care for the sheep" (John 10:11-13).

The good shepherd's primary duties are to guide, provide food and water, protect and deliver, gather back to the herd those that were lost, and to nurture and provide security (Carnes 163). This is reflected in the first five verses of the famous Psalm 23: "He makes me lie down in green pastures; he leads me beside still waters; he leads me in right path...." Shepherds had always to look for new grazing fields since low-lying ground vegetation was the primary means of sustenance of sheep. The shepherd in caring for the sheep saw to it that they were not overdriven. Thus, shepherd carried helpless lambs in his arms (cf. Isa 40:11),

or on his shoulders. At the end of the day, the good shepherd counted each animal as it passed under his hand (Jer 31:13 — "flocks shall again pass under the hands of the one who counts them...). The shepherd kept his flock intact and sought for the lost ones.

Because predators were always a threat to shepherds, the ANE shepherds always had implement of protection, like a rod and staff at hand, a sling to scare small predators, and a pouch for food. The shepherd's staff was important in traversing rocky terrain, while the rod was primarily used as a defense against threats (Borowski 24).

It was very natural then that because tending the flock was a routine of daily life among the ancients that an —extensive and complex stock of shepherd and flock imagery developed throughout ANE. It was one of human's earliest symbols, and is used repeatedly in the Bible to picture God, or national leaders ruling over their people (Vancil 20). Indeed, the shepherd imagery was a common motif of ancient Near Eastern royal ideology. It was widely used for wise kings, and also often for kings at war, like King David.

2.5.5 Shepherds in the Old Testament

According to Gibson John in his book, *Language and Imagery in the Old Testament*, the Hebrew bible identifies shepherd רועה *ra'ah*, which designates guard and the disposition to care and lead. Literally it means keeper of sheep. The first keeper of sheep was Adam's son Abel (Gn. 4:2). Shepherding was the chief occupation of the Israelites in the early days of the patriarchs: Abraham (Gn. 12:16); Rachael (Gn. 29:9); Jacob (Gn. 30:31-40); Moses (Ex.3:1). As cultivation of crops increased, shepherding fell from favour and was assigned to younger sons, hirelings, and slaves. Farmers, such as in Egypt, even hated shepherds (Gn. 46:34). According to Butler Trent in *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary* shepherds led sheep to pasture and water (Ps 23) and protected them from wild animals (1 Sam.17: 34-35). Shepherds guarded their flocks at night whether in the open or in sheepfolds where they

counted the sheep as they entered. They took care of the sheep and even carried weak lambs in their arms (Isa. 40:11) (1484). This idea was further emphasized by Adams Jay E. in his book, *Shepherding God's Flock.* Here he brought out the enormity of the role of the shepherd as well as the risk he stood to experience (211). Later in the history of the people of Israel, "shepherd" came to designate not only persons who herded sheep but also kings (2Sam. 5:2) and God Himself. Later prophets referred to Israel's leaders as shepherds (Jer. 23; Ezek. 34).

Psalm 23 is a key passage regarding the metaphor of the shepherd in the Hebrew Bible, especially because it refers to Yahweh as shepherd. This ideology forms the theological foundation of the New Testament shepherd image. There is a two–fold dimension of Yahweh as the divine shepherd: He is both shepherd–king and shepherd– god. In developing this idea of shepherd-king, Childs Brevard in his book, *Introduction to the Old Testament* opines that even though the idea was prevalent, it was not strictly cultic. He writes,

> The Hebrew scripture bears the belief in the divinity of the shepherd-king of Israel but this understanding was devoid of any strictly cultic paraphernalia. It rather asserts the supernatural endowments of the one who assumes the role whether by divine calling or by popular acclaim (76).

According to ANET edited by Pritchard James, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* Yahweh is depicted as shepherd and king in the formation of Israel. Like the ancient Near Eastern kings, Yahweh is perceived in both roles, and their relationship is intertwined. Prior to the era of the monarchy, many biblical characters exhibited the qualities of a shepherd. Abraham was privileged to have had Yahweh making a covenant with him (Gen. 12:1–3), and through him blessings flowed to his entire household (338). This covenant was an everlasting one: therefore, it would also benefit the descendants of Abraham

(Gen. 17:13). The imputed authority vested in Abraham made him a channel of blessings to his people, his flock.

In the Hebrew Bible Yahweh is perceived as a shepherd. He led the Israelites like a flock through the wilderness (Ps. 77:21). Careful examination shows that the shepherding responsibility was passed on from Yahweh to his earthly shepherds such as David (2 Sam. 5:2; 7:7–8). Similar to the kings in the ancient Near East, David was a king as well as a shepherd. In the Hebrew Bible the metaphor of the shepherd was applied both to Yahweh and the earthly king. Bonino, M. J in his book, *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age* asserts Yahweh is the overseeing shepherd who ensures that a reliable shepherd is provided because an unreliable one will destroy and scatter his flock (Jer. 23:1) and will neglect feeding them (Ezek. 34:7-10). The metaphorical figure of the shepherd that was applied to David as king of Israel, and to Yahweh the God of Israel, illustrates the two aspects of the shepherd metaphor as shepherd–king and shepherd–god in the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Near Eastern literature.

The metaphorical reference to kings as shepherds is one of the oldest titles in the ancient Near East. Marc Zvi Brettler contends in his article, "God is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor" in *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, that the metaphor of the shepherd applied to God indicates that "he is the ideal king," and in comparison, is better than all other royal shepherds (39). Brettler also argues that the crook of the shepherd is used for "comfort" rather than punishment. The most common role of the shepherd-king is to lead. For example, in Numbers 27:17 Joshua is not simply a leader: he leads like a shepherd-king "who shall go out before them and come in before them, who shall lead them out and bring them in; that the congregation of the Lord may not be as sheep which have no shepherd." Thus, he demonstrated the role of leadership.

Another role of the shepherd-king was to feed or provide. Yahweh promised that a day will come when there will be shepherds who will feed the flock with "knowledge and understanding" (Jer. 3:15). This verse depicts the role of the king as a caring shepherd, feeding the people of Yahweh, not with physical food, but rather the precepts of Yahweh. David exemplified this role as he ruled by the power of Yahweh, which caused the surrounding nations to fear the nation of Israel. Brettler further asserts that the feeding on knowledge and prudence mentioned in Jeremiah 3:15 is probably the counselling of the people by the king in the proper ways of Yahweh and is, therefore, another way of saying that they will be led by the shepherd-king according to the way acceptable to Yahweh. Although David died many years before the Babylonian exile, it is reasonable to interpret Ezekiel's reference to the shepherd who will feed God's flock (Ezek. 34:23) as a reference to the Davidic rule which will continue even after the exile, in the example of David as a shepherd-king (39). Agreeing with the above view, Eissfeldt Otto writes in his book, *The Old Testament: An Introduction,*

> The shepherd-king is to protect the afflicted sheep. When there is no shepherd, or the shepherd lacks understanding and tact, the flock will be vulnerable. A foolish shepherd will abandon the flock and leave it to the mercy of a predator. The lost sheep will be neglected and scattered. It is the responsibility of the shepherd to shield the sheep from harm or danger (63).

The role of protecting was also one of keeping the flock from scattering. For example, in Jeremiah 10:21 the foolish shepherd who did not consult Yahweh will fail to protect the flock and prevent it from scattering. As Yahweh was overarching shepherd, the earthly shepherds were to consult him for divine guidance concerning the journey ahead. Danger in the form of an ambush lay ahead and was hidden from the earthly shepherd, but not from the

divine one. If the shepherds did not inquire of Yahweh, their foolishness will endanger themselves and the safety of the flock (66).

In summation, Jonathan Gan, in his Thesis, *The Metaphor of the Shepherd in Zechariah 11:4-7* holds that of all the roles of shepherd in the Old Testament, leading was the most prominent. The roles of feeding and protecting were less so. This image has been down played in many studies, which more often than not have focused on caring, feeding, and protecting. It is argued that leading implies these three functions. But the direction that the shepherd provides, by this leadership, brings prosperity to his flock. And likewise, the king/leader will bring prosperity to the nation (13).

Furthermore, according to Green Joel in his book, *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels,* the agrarian and cultural background of shepherding in the biblical world functions as the backdrop for understanding Jesus as shepherd in the Gospels. Shepherds were essential in the ancient world, caring for their own animals yet also hired to tend the large flocks of other owners (859). The main concern of the shepherd was to provide the sheep or goats with food, water and protection from predators or thieves. This common way of life is an obvious source for the shepherd/flock imagery prevalent throughout the Bible. The Old Testament is replete with pastoral imagery as a way to depict God's relationship with God's people, and this is carried over into the New Testament for Jesus and his disciples.

Although the symbol is most often used in the Old Testament for describing God's care for Israel, Israel's rulers were also viewed as shepherds. The image takes on a positive role when it comes to God as the ideal shepherd (Ezek. 34:5-6; cf Isa. 40:11; Ps. 23), but Israel's leaders are condemned for their neglect of the flock (Jer. 10:21; Zech. 11:15-17; 13:7-9). Green further asserts that the Gospel writers most certainly borrow the image of shepherd for Jesus from their scriptures and their social location, but then they situate the

imagery in the larger narrative context of their interpretations of Jesus' ministry. Taking cues from the literary world of the individual Gospels and each Gospel writer's portrait of Jesus affords a number of possible shades of meaning for this image of Jesus (859).

2.5.6 Shepherds in the New Testament

The Greek word for shepherd is rendered as poimh,n.. In the New Testament, poimh,n occurs eighteen (18) times, mostly in the Gospels. Outside the Gospel it appears only in Eph 4:11, Heb 13:20, and 1 Pet 2:25. In the Gospels, it is found thrice in Matthew (9:36; 25:32; 26:31), twice in Mark (6:34; 14:27), four times in Luke (2:8, 15, 18, 20), six times in John (10:2, 11 [twice], 12, 14, 16). Only in Eph 4:11 is poimh,n translated as "pastor."

In the Gospel of Luke, the shepherds referred to are all animal shepherds and their mention surrounds the birth of Christ. The shepherds were among the first to visit the new-born babe at the stable. In the other Gospels, in every instance, ―the shepherd, ―the good shepherd, "the one shepherd" all refer to Jesus Christ. In the other verses in Hebrews and I Peter, ―the great shepherd (Heb 13:20), "the shepherd" (1 Pet 2:25), all refer to Jesus Christ. In Matthew 9, Jesus is portrayed as having compassion on his people as sheep without a shepherd and among wolves. In John 10, Jesus talks about himself as the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep (vv. 7-18). In Jesus' description of himself he adds to our understanding of what makes for a good shepherd. The good shepherd is sacrificial. The good shepherd is willing to ignore his own needs in order to meet the needs of the sheep. Over and over in the passage he states the good shepherd gives his own life for his sheep (vv.11, 15, 17, 18). At the end of John's Gospel, Jesus challenged Peter to prove his love after his betrayal

(21:15-17). After each admission of love on Peter's part Jesus said, "Feed my lambs" (v. 15), "Tend my sheep" (v. 16), "Feed my sheep" (v. 17) Jesus entrusts his flock to Peter.

The Gospel of Luke presents the parable of the lost sheep where Jesus tells of the joy of a shepherd when he finds his sheep after a difficult search (Lk 15:4-7). This shepherd imagery is used to show the rejoicing that accompanies the repentance of the sinner. The shepherd would leave the ninety-nine who stayed on the right path in order to search for the one lost sheep. The shepherd's care for the flock of Israel is expanded in Luke to include "tax collectors and sinners" (Lk 15:1; cf. Matt. 9:10), with whom he ate without condemnation.

The Gospel of Matthew uses the image of the shepherd and the flock to illustrate the execution of eschatology judgment. Like a scattered flock the nations are assembled around the glorious throne of the Son of Man (25:3ff.). Here the process of judgment is likened to the separation of the (white) sheep from the (black) goats (Jeremias 493).

Finally, all the ministers of Christ are to be shepherds to their flocks. In Acts 20, the Apostle Paul exhorts the Ephesian elder to "keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God that he obtained with the blood of his own Son" (v. 28). In 1 Peter 5, the Apostle charges the elders at the churches in present day Asia Minor to "shepherd the flock of God among you, not under compulsion, but voluntarily, according to the will of God; and not for sordid gain, but with eagerness; nor yet as lording it over those allotted to your charge, but proving to be examples to the flock" (vv. 2-3).

This section has given us a general survey of shepherd/ shepherding in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible. Our goal was to understand shepherding in its original context in order to fully appreciate Jesus who, in the Gospel of John states, "I am the Good Shepherd."

We have seen that in both the traditions of the Ancient Near East and in the Scriptures, shepherds led their sheep to pasture and water. They protected them from wild animals and guarded their flocks at night whether in the open or in sheepfolds where they counted the sheep as they entered. They took care of the sheep and even carried weak lambs in their arms. They searched for the lost sheep. A good shepherd was willing to sacrifice his own comfort, even his own life, for the sake of his sheep.

Because of the richness of the day-to-day experience of the shepherd, it became the primary metaphor for leaders and even God in the Bible. Both Israel's leaders and God himself are portrayed as shepherds of their flock/people. If Israel's leaders have failed their flock, the Lord God is their good and faithful shepherd. With him as their shepherd, they shall lack nothing. The Old Testament had prophesied the coming of the Good Shepherd who will gather his flock. The Gospels, especially John, portrays Jesus as the Good Shepherd promised by God. Jesus had fulfilled this prophetic role in some measure in his first coming. He will complete it in his second coming when he comes in judgment to separate the righteous from those who did not know Him, and to finally care for and lead those that are his own.

2. 6 THE SACRIFICIAL DEATH OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD

> In Roman eyes, Jesus died the ghastly death of slaves and rebels; in Jewish eyes, he fell under the stricture of Deut. 21:23: 'The one hanged is accursed by God'. To both groups Jesus' trial and execution made him marginal in a terrifying and disgusting way. Jesus was a Jew living in a Jewish Palestine directly or indirectly controlled by

Romans. In one sense he belonged to both worlds; in the end, he was ejected from both (Meier 8).

According to Fillion, L. C. in his book, *The Life of Christ*, at Golgotha, Jesus broke his silence. He spoke not in complaint, but to ask God's forgiveness for his executioners. The seven words Jesus Uttered closed his public ministry as the eight beatitudes opened it. He prayed for his executioners as well as the Jews who were the direct cause of his cruel death. The soldiers divided his Garments. It was customary to fasten at the top of the cross a strip of wood on which was written the reason for the condemnation (538). Jesus of Nazareth King of the Jews, Pilate wrote it in three languages: Latin, Greek and Hebrew. This trilingual inscription according to Brown, in his book *The Gospel and Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary*, presupposes the universal salvific death of Jesus (93). By this inscription, Pilate wished it to be known that Jesus was crucified by reason of that claim. On this Lucien writes in his article in the *The Way* "The Many Deaths of Jesus":

> By inscribing the red paint of Christ's charge and claim, Pilate had thought among other things that he would a little bit exonerate himself from being accused of being an accomplice in Christ's death. He wanted the world to see him as only doing what the Roman law required (289).

At his crucifixion he was jeered at by members of the public, the Jews, chief Priests et al. The Sanhedrin members had come for the pleasure of gazing upon the suffering and humiliation of their victim. The soldiers also insulted him. A little before three O'clock in the afternoon, Jesus in a loud voice uttered the words, *Eloi, Eloi lama sabacthani? "*My God, my God why hast Thou forsaken me?". But God did not forsake him. It is observed that,

> If Christ speaks of abandonment, it is under the impression of a passing disturbance, which seized upon him amid so many moral and physical sufferings and under the

crushing weight of the sins of all mankind, which he had taken upon himself. His cry is indeed, harrowing (Fillion 541).

This was not a cry of despair. It was a call upon God, the call of a submissive Son who though groaning in his desolation, accepts his Father's will and asks only the 'why' of such great suffering.

The last word of Jesus on the cross, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit", shows a submission on the part of Jesus that is eternal. Then he bowed his head and in full exercise of his will, as befitted the messiah, Son of God, breathed his last. It was three O'clock in the afternoon, the ninth hour, the hour when the evening sacrifice was offered in the Temple. None of the four Gospels use the ordinary phrase, "he died", but they all use special forms of expression, to show that he "yielded" or "gave up the ghost" to his Father by a sovereign act of his will (541). This is why he would say that he lays down his life in the Good Shepherd Discourse. Jesus took upon himself the punishment of the *kosmos,* the punishment we merited due to our sin. He was truly the Good Shepherd who laid down his life for his sheep.

2.6.1 Jesus' Death as Substitution

The substitutionary significance of Jesus' suffering and death seems to have been discovered from two starting points in early Christianity. The one was the Lord's Supper tradition and the other was Jesus' saying about his serving in the disciples' midst (Lk 22:27), which appears in an expanded form in Mk10: 45- the saying about ransom. In fact, Jesus having suffered death for our benefit fits in the context of the service to men that informs his whole ministry.

But a fundamental question lies here. Is the death of Jesus merely the consequence of his service or was it in itself a service? On this Pannenberg in his book, *Jesus: God and Man* says,

> Upon this depends its vicarious significance. That is, every service has vicarious character by recognizing a need in the person served that apart from this service that person would have to satisfy for himself. Such vicarious significance does not, however, belong to the consequences that the service has for the one who served, but only to the service itself (259).

Thus, one must ask whether Jesus' death itself had the character of a service. This was unreflectively presupposed in primitive Christianity by understanding Jesus' death in the image of the ransom or of the expiatory sacrifice of the Good Shepherd. Jesus was seen and understood as dying in our stead. The Son of God became a mortal man, sinless in himself, He assumed a nature made subject to suffering and death by man's sin. When the selfishness, ignorance and malice of his contemporaries forced death upon him, he freely and willingly accepted it in a spirit of loving dedication to his Father's will.

Death, whose nature had been filled with disobedience and rejection, was now in Christ suffused by love and submission. The gift of himself in death was accepted by the Father who raised him from the dead. Death is swallowed up in victory. In Christ its meaning has been totally transformed. It no longer means simply man's rebellion against God; it is also now a sign of the presence of God's saving love in the world (260).

2.6.2 Substitution for Israel

The resurrection reveals that Jesus, the Good Shepherd died as a righteous man, not as blasphemer. Rather, those who rejected him as a blasphemer and had complicity in his death were the real blasphemers. His judges rightly deserved the punishment that he received. Thus, he bore their punishment. It is a truism that Jesus' judges were not blasphemers because of the law, but because of the simple fact that they condemned him whom God legitimated.

Tolerance even over against blasphemy has become justifiable only on the basis of the substitutionary significance of Jesus' death (262).

It could be seen that every Jew who was faithful to the law would have acted the way the Jewish authority did. In the light of Jesus' resurrection not only the circle of the Jewish judges, but in principle every Jew under the law is shown to be a blasphemer. The death of Jesus was a death many of his fellow Jews died. Based on this, Moltmann opines in his book, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimension,* that,

> Jesus died the death of a Jew at the hands of the Romans and therefore must be counted as one in the long line of persecuted and murdered Jews. Jesus truly entered the destiny of his people. Jesus experienced what so many Jews before him and afterwards experienced. If Jesus died a Jew's death, then the sufferings of Christ are open for solidarity with 'the suffering Israel', the Israel of that time and the Israel of today (160).

The only difference between Jesus' death and that of his countrymen was and is that his death was salvific and substitutionary, he died our death as a noble shepherd.

2.6.3 Substitution for Humanity

Apart from the Jews, the Romans also participated in Jesus's crucifixion as representatives of the Gentile world. But the participation of the Romans was of a completely different sort, conditioned by slanderous accusations, and not motivated by the essence of Jesus' claim, as was the judgement of the Jews (Pannenberg 261). How can it be established that Jesus' death is a substitution for humanity? This question is nicely answered in the following words:

> Only after it is otherwise.... established that Jesus in his death suffered abandonment by God in death as the effect of the pride of equality with God, which separates man universally from God, and has taken it away once and for all, might one find non-

Jewish humanity represented by the activity of the Roman procurator in Jesus' trial; then Jesus has interceded with his death for non-Jewish humanity as well (263).

Paul has pointed the way to such general substitution for humanity. For Paul, that Jesus has died for all men (2Cor. 5:14ff) is related to the significance of the cross as the sign of Jesus' rejection by Israel in the name of the law. Indeed, Jesus' death in fact, did become the entrance for the Gentiles into Israel's story of election. St. Paul links the Jewish law with the general anthropological relation between sin and death, thus making possible to relate Jesus' death to all humanity.

When one understands the universal human significance of the Jewish law as the explicit formulation of the universally valid relation between deed and its consequences, as one form of the legal structure of social life which is realized everywhere in different ways, then the Jewish people actually represent humanity in general in its rejection of Jesus as a blasphemer in the name of the law and Jesus' noble and salvific death cleanses them too (263).

2.6.4 Concept of Inclusive Substitution

To expound on this theme, we pose to ask some basic questions. To what extent does Jesus' death have vicarious significance? Are other men spared anything thereby? Jesus died the death all have incurred, the death of the blasphemer. In this sense, he died for us, for our sins. Of course, this does not in any way mean that we no longer have to die. It does rather mean that no one else has to die in the complete rejection in which Jesus died. He died as one expelled, excluded from the nearness of the God in whose nearness he had known himself to be in a unique way, the precursor of the imminent kingdom of God. Pannenberg stresses the exceptionality in Jesus' death as follows:

> .... No one else must die this death of eternal damnation to the extent that he has community with Jesus. Whoever is bound up with Jesus no longer dies alone, excluded from all community, above all no longer as one who is divorced from

> community with God and his future salvation. Even he who is condemned by the state as a criminal, he who is outlawed by the spiritual and more powers of society, is no longer wholly forsaken (264).

Whoever is bound up with Jesus dies, to be sure, but he dies in hope of the life of resurrection from the dead that has already appeared in Jesus. In this sense, Jesus' death has vicarious significance for all humanity; humanity has a hope beyond death, the hope of the coming resurrection. This is the concept of inclusive substitution that was developed by Philip Marheineke: Jesus' dying includes ours in itself and thereby transforms the latter into a dying in hope. Nevertheless; inclusive substitution contains an element belonging exclusively to the death of Jesus. Only him died forsaken while the death of all other men can find safety in community with him. He died as one who willingly accepts it as supreme sacrifice for his sheep.

CHAPTER THREE

EXEGESIS OF JOHN 10:1-18

3.1 AN OVERVIEW OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

The Gospel of John is admittedly different from the Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke. But that difference does not imply separate. The Trinitarian slogan of the Church is useful here—distinct but not separate. John's gospel is distinct but not separate from the Synoptics. It is possible to say that John is a part of the "fourfold gospel." (Osweto 45).

This introduction leads to say that, if the Gospel of John had been the only account available of the life of Jesus, we might still be fascinated and intrigued by it. But the problem, which it presents, would not be so complex and difficult as they become when it is read as the last of the four Gospels, all purporting to describe the same thing.

The Gospel of John begins with the philosophical statement (Jn. 1:1-18) the pre-existent *logos*, which has no counterpart in the Synoptic Gospels. Then move into familiar territory, in spite of the very different presentation from the Synoptic parallels. But this hope is quickly shuttered by the call of the first disciples (Jn. 1:35-51), which has virtually nothing in common with the Synoptic accounts (e.g. Mk. 1:16-20; Lk. 5:1-11), and indeed seems irreconcilable with them. This problem of the relation to the Synoptic Gospels continue through to the end (Bultmann 376).

At the same time a reading of John shows also differences of style. After the first two chapters, and the surprise caused by discovering the cleansing of the Temple (Jn. 2:13-22) before the ministry of Jesus has even begun, instead of near the end, the narrative ceases to be episodic and gives way to long discourses and debates of Jesus in Jerusalem, which are

completely differently from the Synoptic Gospels. This difference extends beyond the literary form. Here Jesus emerges as a remote personality, almost wholly taken up with the subject of his personal authority in relation to God (377).

In brief, it is that I can give the breakdown on Jesus life as follows: (1) birth to death and resurrection (as Mathew and Luke do); from (2) Christ's baptism to his resurrection (as Mark does). However, John spent forty percent of his gospel describing one week—the most crucial week—Jesus' life (Jn. 12-20:25). John is preoccupied with the week of Christ's death and resurrection. By this, he is providing an overall clue to his story of Christ by featuring his death and resurrection. The beginning of John's gospel is not genealogy (Matthew), not godspell (Mark), not angelic annunciation (Luke). John begins with a magnificent paean of the glory of the Son (Word/Logos)—God's only begotten. The Johannine Prologue (Jn. 1:1-18) wondrously introduces this gospel that soars like the eagle. The Johannine Epilogue (Jn. ch. 21) poignantly envelops the gospel with the conversation between the eschatological Shepherd and the destined under-shepherd reaching the climax of commissioning Apostle Peter to feed the lambs. In between Prologue and Epilogue, there is his glory, the glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth (Jn. 1:14) (Brown 148).

Thematically, a close observation of the Gospel of John reveals that it broadly consists of three main theological issues. The center of these themes is Christology. These themes are thrilling and perhaps necessary to brief in this overview. I will summarize them under the headings Christocentric, Eschatological and Soteriological. John asks his readers to continually reflect on the question, "Who is Jesus?" This Christological question is answered from the Prologue to the Epilogue, which will be in detail discussed under exegesis in this research. The Gospel of John presents Jesus as the Word/Logos, the Son of God, who is God himself. This high antic Christology explains the centrality of Christ in John's gospel. From ch. 1:1 to 21:25, John concentrates on the person of Christ such that, he will not allow the

reader to take eyes off Jesus. This adds to the conviction of many readers that the central character in John's Gospel drama in Jesus Christ (149).

3.2 THE CONTEXT AND STRUCTURE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD DISCOURSE

In the gospel narrative, the Good Shepherd Discourse 10:1-18, is located within the context of the protracted controversy between Jesus and his opponents which extends from Jn. 5:1-10:42. The main thrust of the controversy is the issue of identity of Jesus. Jesus' claim of being the definitive messenger of God arising from the fact of his being the Son of God is constantly refuted by his opponents. On the basis of this unique relationship with God, an unprecedented unity exists between him and the Father, which his actions are only revelatory testimonies (Umoh 285). The Shepherd Discourse is placed directly after one of such actions – the cure of the congenitally blind man – and the long discussion with the Pharisees following the cure (Jn. 9:1-41). It is within this context that the definitive rejection of Jesus and his claims (Jn.10:39), takes place (287).

The history and the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel through the years have been greatly influenced by the judgment of Clement of Alexandria as preserved by Eusebius, the Church historian. According to Clement, John the Fourth Evangelist, was encouraged by his pupils and irresistibly moved by the Spirit, to write a gospel that was no longer interested in the physical facts already recorded in the Synoptics, but one that was to be "a spiritual gospel" (Eusebius, 6:4).

As a consequence of this assessment, the Fourth Gospel has ever since been dated late, and is always considered to be the last canonical gospel to be written. Secondly, readers and interpreters of the gospel have often sought and found primarily spiritual and theological perspectives within the gospel. Even later generations of interpreters had reasons to doubt Clement's assessment having discovered other elements beyond spirituality in the gospel,

there was still careful avoidance of such interpretations that could have historical or socio-political linkages and connotations (Ehrman 411).

From the language and the tone of the text, it is now obvious that historical as well as socio-political realities in the life of the Johannine community also found expression in the gospel stories and discourses. For a more comprehensive interpretation of the gospel, these realities must be duly acknowledged. For this reason, a spiritual interpretation alone as proposed by Clement no longer satisfies the desire to know as much as possible about the gospel of John and the community that produced it (418). It is this understanding that the Gospel is not just a spiritual Gospel but it has socio-political sphere that is why this study is undertaken to look at the Good Shepherd as a political leadership model of our time.

The consequences of this unfolding interpretative procedure on individual periscopes of the gospel including the Good Shepherd Discourse are obvious. Like other periscopes within the gospel narrative, the Shepherd Discourse has had its interpretative history including a strong spiritualizing thrust of the patristic period. Without playing down the importance of any interpretative model and their effects on our understanding of the Shepherd Discourse, other interpretative models could also be applied. It is possible that such models in the light of new emphases about the gospel, could also reveal other dimensions of the discourse. Here one would like to call attention to the fact that no text is merely an object on which the reader or interpreter works analytically to extract a permanently univocal meaning. On the contrary, a text is a structure in which readers engage in the process of achieving meaning, and therefore, it is by nature open to more than one dimension. For this research, the political dimension of leadership as shown in the altruistic disposition of the shepherd is considered and treated.

On account of its structure and context, the Good Shepherd Discourse has attracted the interest of interpreters of the Fourth Gospel of every generation. The main lines of

discussion on its context could however be broadly classified into three: literary, historical and theological analyses.

The intrusive beginning of Jn 10:1 within the context, provokes an appreciable literary debate on coherence. For some the discourse does not belong to its present context and as a result of this have undertaken structural reorganization of the entire text to create a more coherent thought pattern for a better understanding and interpretation (Ehrman 420). Others point to the historical difficulties in the text particularly trying to identify the addressees of the discourse. All along Jesus had been talking with the Pharisees in reaction to the news that they had expelled the cured blind man from the Synagogue. Is the discourse, which the gospel identifies as *paroimia* meant for these Pharisees or had it a different audience historically, and therefore, had a wider application?

The literary and historical issues also raise theological difficulties regarding the identity of the contrast figures to the ideal shepherd and the overall theological purpose of the discourse within the context of the gospel. Here we add that there are readers of the gospel who accept the present structural arrangement of the discourse within is present context and therefore do not need any restructuring hypothesis. This opinion is plausible above all for the following reasons: Jn 10:1-13 seems to be arranged in antithesis (Harrelson 73) vv 1-6 is arranged in contrasts. The negative image of the stranger who enters the sheepfold illegally is contrasted with the shepherd whom the doorkeeper opens the door to the sheepfold. The shepherd whose voice the sheep recognizes is contrasted with the stranger whose voice the sheep does not recognize. Whereas the sheep follow the shepherd or move towards him, they run away from the stranger. In vv. 10-13, the characters of the shepherd and the contrast figures are also arranged in contrasts. The thief and robber are contrasted with the good shepherd in their relationship with the sheep. Whereas the shepherd gives life to the sheep,

the thief and the robber comes only to steal and destroy. The hireling abandons the sheep when there is danger, but the shepherd lays down his life for the sheep (78).

There is no doubt that this is a polemical presentation that fits well within the context of controversy between Jesus and his opponents. Being situated within this context, the Shepherd Discourse appears to tell a story of the life situation of the Johannine community and its relationship with others.

3.3 THE EXEGESIS OF JOHN 10:1-18

In the passage of John 10, Jesus identifies himself as the "Good Shepherd" ~o poimhn ~o kaloj, distinguishing himself from those shepherds of Israel who are censured by Yahweh in the Book of Ezekiel. They were accused of being “wicked” "shepherds of Israel" who nourished and dressed themselves at the expense of the flock, doing naught to minister to the needs of the ailing or wounded (Ezekiel 34:3-4). Jesus perceived the Pharisees standing before him in the manner of the shepherds Ezekiel denounced. The paralytic man in John 5 had spent many years unable to walk, and was required to sustain himself by begging. When Jesus healed him on the Sabbath, the Jews were infuriated - preferring the man not be healed at all rather than him being healed on the Sabbath. The same religious elite had no empathy with the woman caught in the deed of adultery (John 7:53-8:11). They were more disposed to using her as an artifice to condemn Jesus for contradicting the Law of Moses.

Similarly, in the preceding passage of John 9, the healing of the man born blind significantly troubled the Pharisees. These religious elite did not think of the Israelites as sheep, but as an uneducated, blighted rabble (John 7:49). To the religious elite, the "fold" (of those predestined to enter the kingdom of God) was well thought-out as a type of private

club, of which they were the membership committee. Thus, they had no consideration for the man born blind - rejected as human debris (Umoh 34)

Therefore, Carson suggests, the veracity of John 10 only makes sense when we realize it stands with John 9, both "internally and relationally." As a result, the "I am the good shepherd" section (10:1-18) has as its setting the story of the man born blind (9:1-34). Jesus gives sight to the blind man, triggering an argument with the Pharisees, who completely denied that Jesus had carried out a miracle, and subsequently undertook to scandalize him. The "light of the world" (9:5) passes judgment on the willful and the intractable blindness of the Pharisees - the false shepherds of Israel who do not love the sheep, but in contrast drive them out of the fold.

A fascinating addition transpires when the Pharisees question the blind man's parents, asking, "How then does he now see?" (9:19). The parents answer, "We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind; but how he now sees, we do not know; or who opened his eyes, we do not know, he is of age ask him. He will speak for himself" (9:20-21). The narrator expounds, “His parents said these things because they feared the Jews; for the Jews had already agreed that if any man would confess him as Christ, he would be put out (γωγος) of the synagogue. Therefore, his parents said, ‘He is of age, ask him’” (9:22-23). Alas, these parents are the embodiment of the hired hand who “sees the wolf coming, leaves the sheep, and flees” (10:12). Realizing they are in jeopardy, they desert their son (Gerd 251).

The story of the man congenitally blind ended with him directing testimonial proof to Jesus, and the Pharisees driving the man out – a poignant and sardonic incident in which the once blind man is blessed with spiritual insight as well as physical sight while the spiritual leaders of Israel refuse to see (9:35-41).

Therefore, instead of the Pharisees looking for Jesus, and leading others into the light, they have turned from him and become false, blind guides. For this reason, illustrated by the

"figure" (Jn10:6) of the sheepfold and its shepherd, Jesus by way of prophetic visualization offensively accentuates the absence and shortcomings of the fabricated guardians of Israel (Jn 10:1,5, 6-13) (Gordon 261).

The proof that these different metaphors are really one continuous story is also found in John10:19-21, which repeats two of the themes stated earlier, the division of the Jews concerning Jesus (Jn 9:16 and Jn10:19) and the importance of the healing as testimony to Jesus' Godly power (Jn 9:33 and Jn10:21).

This exegetical discourse will be treated from the following themes as found in the text of John 10:1-18. (i) On entering the sheepfold 1-6, (ii) Jesus the Door/Gatekeeper 7-10, (iii) The Good Shepherd vs Hireling 11-13, and (iv) Jesus the Messianic Good Shepherd 14-18.

3.3.1 On Entering the Sheepfold 10:1-6

> Amhvvvn amhn legw umin ,o mh eisercomenoς dia thς quraς eiς thn aulh,n twn probatwn alla, anabainwn a,llacoqen, .ekenino ς klepthς esti kai lhsthς. .O de. eisercomenoς dia thς quraς poimhn esti tw/n probatwn. Toutw 'o qurwroς anoigei kai ta. probata th/ς fwnhς autou/ akouei kai ta. idia probata kalei kat o.noma kai exagei auta kai otavn ta idia probata ekbalh emprojqen autw/n porenetai kai ta, probata autw/ a,kolouqei oti oidasi thn fwnhn autou/ allotriw de ou mh a,kolouqhswsin a,lla, feuxontai a,p autou/ oti ouk oidasi tw/n a,llotriwn thn fwnhn (The Interlinear Bible).

> Truly, truly, I say to you, he who does not enter the sheepfold by the door but climbs in by another way, that man is a thief and a robber; but he who enters by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the gatekeeper opens; the sheep hear his voice, and he calls his own sheep by name and leads them out. When he has brought out all his own, he goes before them, and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice. A stranger they will not follow, but they will flee from him, for they do not know the voice of strangers.

This *paroimia* (paroimia) Jesus uses with them, but they did not understand what he was saying to them. The serious or solemn "Truly, Truly" opens rolling metaphors, all based on first-century sheep husbandry. There is a sheep pen, a pen where all the sheep are kept. The sheep pen pictures the place of acceptance by God, or a place of safety and security in God's presence. The whole paroimia has to do with a false shepherd and the true shepherd.

Both go after the sheep but for different motivations. The sheep pen can be entered. There is a door into the sheep pen – an entrance, a way to get in – and the gate is the only "acceptable" way to enter. Some shepherds climb into the sheep pen "by some other way" (αλλαχοθεν). The word *by* is important. It indicates origin. The false shepherd *comes by* and originates from …some other direction, some other way, some other position, some other source, some other road (Brown 95). Despite the fact that the image alters appreciably from the preceding chapter, the opening section is reinforced by concentrating at once on "thieves and robbers", (κλεπτης και ληστης) offering something of a clarification on the preceding story *(cf.* 9:39-41).

The very same words were used to describe Judas (a thief) and Barabbas (a robber). It is an awful thing for a person to be put into the same class as Judas and Barabbas, two who were as opposite from Christ as any man could be. The false shepherd is a thief: a seducer

and a deceiver, a crafty and dishonest man, a man who will use any means to get into the sheep pen to steal the sheep. A robber: a man who will use violence and cruelty and will destroy and devour if necessary to get into the sheep pen. The character of those who "steal and kill and destroy" (v. 10), is juxtaposed with the true shepherd. Thus, we are reminded of the manipulation and maltreatment the man born blind experienced at the hands of the religious authorities. Within the difference between the true shepherd and the bandits, Newbigin suggests, that two separate parabolic sayings have been spliced together, in view of the fact that the gatekeeper -θυρωρος- (v. 3) "does not play any further part" (126). However, Carson advocates that this detail would have been customary and recognizable to the Johannine audience, suggesting that first-century sheep farming families were often part of cooperatives. Thus, the need for large enclosures and a hired 'watchman' to guard the enclosure gates. Carson continues, and says "many" have attempted to "get behind" chapter 10 and yet the 'figure of speech' (v. 6) is clearly Johannine. Just as John 15 does not offer a parable of a *vine*, but merely offers reflections "on viticulture" with imperative symbolic associations spelt out, our text presents details on sheep husbandry, not as an end in itself, but as means to communicate the desired meaning within allegory. Nevertheless, it is the text that directs the sheep husbandry symbols, not the other way around (233).

The gatekeeper or watchman motif plays an important symbol in the narrative. In authentic parabolic fashion the Pharisees are ironically 'thrown beside' the gatekeeper and characterized. The incongruity is striking - since the Pharisees considered themselves the gatekeepers of God's kingdom - as they *slam the door* in the face of the man who was born blind, but in truth, he just found the *door* in Jesus and entered into eternal life (Achtemeier, Green et al. 363).

Jesus uses this time-honoured (animal husbandry) scene to reveal how he is Israel's True Shepherd, and how the Pharisees are evil shepherds; "thieves and robbers" who do not

have the courage to present themselves to the gatekeeper, because he will recognize them and will not permit them right of entry to the sheep - because their objective is to steal sheep and to kill them. Therefore, to get access into the sheepfold, they must enter by some other means than through the door. They must climb over the enclosure. Their *modus operandi* to get to the sheep makes it obvious that they have murder in their hearts. A true shepherd enters the sheepfold in such a manner that makes evident his right to his sheep is lawful. He comes to the gatekeeper, who knows him and permits him entry through the door (Deffinbaugh 211).

The shepherd who enters the appointed door is the true shepherd (Jesus Christ). He knows where the door is and the way into the sheep pen. Therefore. He uses the door. There is no reason for Him not to use it, no reason for Him to climb in any other way. His purpose is not to steal some sheep from the Owner (God) and start a flock of His own. Such a thought is the farthest thing from His mind. Therefore, the Shepherd enters the sheep pen by the door. The door was made for Him and the sheep to enter, therefore, He uses it. The Shepherd knows the sheep, He knows each one by name. This is said to have been a fact among shepherds and their sheep in Jesus' day. Shepherds actually knew each sheep individually, even in large herds. The fact is certainly true with Christ and His sheep. The words *His own* (σιδια) mean He calls His own, not as a whole, not as a herd, but as individuals (Achtemeier 365). The Shepherd, the Lord Jesus Christ, knows each of His sheep by name. The sheep know the Shepherd's voice. They know both His sound and His words. The sound of His voice is not uncertain and unclear, not weak and frail, not quivering and indecisive. The words of His voice are the words of care and tenderness, of warning and safety, of truth and security (214). The sheep flee from strange voices. They do not know a stranger's voice. His sound and words are different.

The parabolic motif of leadership is enduring. The history of the world is full of accounts of those wanting to, and attaining rule - for the most part "thieves and robbers" - who have not pursued the approach of Jesus - the way of unmitigated self-giving - *kenosis* - which is essentially what differentiates the good shepherd from other shepherds. Thus, Jesus' metaphoric intention points to a central theme; the one who exercises (authentic) leadership must enter by the one true door, which is Jesus, and which he alone has opened. The authentic leader who crosses this threshold will be acknowledged, trusted and followed (Newbigin 126).

3.3.2 Jesus: The Door/Gatekeeper (*Egw eimi h, qura*) 10:7-11

> *Tauthn th,n paroimian eipen autoij o, .Ihsouj ekenoi de ouk ,egnwsan tina hn a elalei autoij) Eipen oun palin autoij ~o ,Ihsouj(,Amhn amhn legw umin oti ,Egw eimi h qura tw/n probatwn) pantej osoi pro emou .hlqon kleptai eisi kai lhstai ,all' ouk .hkousan autw/n ta probata) .egw eimi h qura di, emou/ ean tij eiselqh(swqhsetai(kai eiseleusetai kai exeleusetai(kai nomhn eu.rhsei) ~o klepthj ouk e=rcetai ei mh ina kleyh kai qush kai apolesh) egw hllqon ina zwhn ecwsi(kai perisson ecwsin* (The Interlinear Bible).

> So, Jesus again said to them, “Truly, truly, I say to you, I am the door of the sheep. All who came before me are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not heed them. I am the door; if any one enters by me, he will be saved, and will go in and out and find pasture. The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy; I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly.

"And when he was alone, those who were about him with the twelve asked him concerning the parables" (Mark 4:10). As with the synoptic testimony, so it is in the Johannine witness - parabolic veracity causes ignorance and indifference - so with enhanced assertion ("Truly, truly") Jesus lays it down again. At the same time as being a zeitgeist image, the door is fundamentally eschatological. Newbigin advocates, the door is the veracious way of access to a futurity that can be "communicated" and experienced in the present (127).

Jesus claims to be the Door of the sheep. Jesus is probably referring to the gate of the community sheep pen or a community pasture that housed all the flocks of an area. There is, however, another descriptive picture of Jesus as the door. When the sheep were kept in ravines surrounded by several rocky walls, the shepherd himself literally became the door, for during the night he would simply lie across the opening. The sheep could get out only by going over him, and the enemies of the sheep could get into the sheep only by going through him. Access in or out was only through the shepherd. By “door” (*qura*) Jesus meant

> He is the way or entrance into the sheep pen. Jesus Christ is the way … into God’s presence, into God’s acceptance, into the kingdom of God, into eternal life. Therefore, if a man wishes to enter where God is, he must enter through the Door of Christ, for Christ is the only Door into God’s presence (Koester 64).

Jesus used the clear claim to deity: “I am”. All others who claim to be the door are thieves and robbers (κλεπται και λησται). There are some who claim to be the door and to

have the way to God. They claim to know the right way and to have the newest ideas and the latest truth and knowledge. But Jesus says that they are thieves and robbers. They are out to steal the sheep, both their wool (possessions) and their lives (loyalty). They want both their wool and their lives, for if they have both they have the sheep's permanent loyalty (Morris 89). The proof that Jesus is the only Door and that all others are false doors is the sheep themselves. The sheep do not listen to the voices of false *doors*. The real sheep of God know the Shepherd's voice and have the ability to discern it. If they hear the voice of a false shepherd, they know that he and his sheep gate are false. Jesus is the only door that opens to healthy and lasting nourishment. He is the only door that leads to true pasture, the pasture that has the living stream flowing through it and the pasture that has the living food in it. The thief misleads and deceives the sheep, leading them through a door that leads to destruction. By leading the sheep away from the restrictiveness of Christ, the false teacher becomes a thief – a thief in that he steals the soul of the sheep from God, leading it into a sheep pen that will be destroyed (Barret 261).

Shifting from the more general third person ("the one who," "he," "him, "his") to the "very specific first person singular ("I," "me") Jesus makes it apparent from here on that he is speaking of himself as "the True Shepherd" and "the Good Shepherd." He now speaks of himself as the "door," ending all reference to the "doorkeeper." Hence, Jesus is *all in all,* the very crux of the narrative illustration - the Son of man - the ladder - the vocative interchange and relay between heaven and earth (John 1:51) (Lee 187).

Jesus expounds further on the perils of earthly leadership, with obvious allusions to the religious leaders and their measurements of inadequacy. Within a couple of sentences, Jesus colours a landscape where all humanity yearns for both safety and liberty - alas, very often the two are mutually exclusive - because the redeemer abruptly turns into the despot who can provide safety only as they sacrifice freedom. Jesus rightly deciphers humanity's

perennial panoply of so-called and self-styled liberators who present liberty and safety on twisted conditions, none of which exemplify the veracity of Jesus' ministry (189). People who recognize his "voice" are not led astray by such compromised proposals. Quite the reverse, such people realize, as they keep to the way of Jesus that he provides, equally, sanctuary and liberty. Additionally, as understood in 14:1-6, "the way" or "door", which is Jesus, is likewise the way by which he comes to us and the way by which we move out of ('ek% – and away from ('apo% – customary defences into new freedoms. As a result, we are given the gift of liberty and the choice to move in and out, as we realize all our needs and requirements are fulfilled (Newbigin 127).

3.3.3The Good Shepherd Versus the Hireling 10:11-13

> Egw eimi o, poimnh o, kaloj o, poimnh o, kaloj thn yuchn autou tiqhsin upper twn probatwn) ~o misqwtoj de(kai ouk wn poimhn(ou ouk eisi ta probata idia(qewrei ton lukon ercomenon(kai afihsi ta probata(kai feugei kai ~o lukoj arpazei auta(kai skorpizei ta probata) ~o de misqwtoj feugei(oti misqwtoj esti(kai ou melei autw/ peri tw/n probatwn (The Interlinear Bible).
>
> I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep. He who is a hireling and not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, sees the wolf coming and leaves the sheep and flees; and the wolf snatches them and scatters them. He flees because he is a hireling and cares nothing for the sheep.

The allegory of the door has been stretched to its "breaking-point," as it yields to another which has been, from the very beginning, in the background. Jesus is the good

shepherd - he is the only one who can do for the flock what God can do and what he has over and over again assured (Ford 168). There are two reasons why Jesus is called the Good Shepherd. First, Jesus is called the "Good Shepherd" because He gave and sacrificed His life for the sheep and second, because He is not a hired or employed shepherd. Jesus is the Shepherd by birth. He was born to be the Shepherd with all the Shepherd's right. The hired shepherd was just a man passing through who was a temporary help. He was a man hired to look after the sheep until the real shepherd came along. He was not the true, permanent shepherd. He was a false, unfaithful, and irresponsible shepherd. His interest was not a calling, but … a job and profession, money and comfort, acceptance and recognition, position and prestige, authority and esteem (Carson 264).

The false, unfaithful and irresponsible shepherd has little if any sense of responsibility for the sheep. He seeks to benefit self, not the sheep. He is a shepherd for what he can get out of it, not to serve and care for the sheep. His primary interest is not the sheep but job security: wages and benefits, position and prestige, money and comfort. He values himself much more than the sheep. He seeks his own things and not the things of others. He has not natural care for the state of the sheep. He has no interest in seeking the lost sheep, lest his life be threatened and placed in jeopardy. The irresponsible shepherd runs away when he sees danger (wolf). He seeks to save himself and to protect his own security and position even if it means forsaking the sheep and leaving them exposed to the danger.

The irresponsible shepherd causes the sheep to be caught in danger and in error. Some of the sheep are ravaged and eaten by the dangerous wolf. According to Brown, the wolf is anything or any power that seeks to destroy the sheep, such as worldliness, false autonomy, irreligion and carnal thoughts. The remaining sheep are scattered throughout the wilderness of the world and lost to the Owner (God) (261). The irresponsible shepherd lacks genuine care for the sheep. He is not involved and concerned with the fate and eternal welfare of the

sheep. But in contrast to "an ordinary shepherd- or an ordinary leader – this shepherd is prepared to die for his sheep" so they can be given, as a gift the "superabundant" life of God and stands to fulfill all that was lacking in the hired shepherd.

However, by the concentrated language, Jesus points us away from the metaphorical to himself - always anticipating the cross. Far from being unplanned, Jesus' death is not exemplary, but offered as a redeeming sacrifice for his sheep. It is precisely what qualifies him to be the good shepherd.

Once again, Jesus overlays another contrasting leadership motif; juxtaposing true leadership alongside its counterfeit, the hireling, which is an overreach of "the ego" and subsequently, recognized or not, the "glory of the leader." The unloving hireling's only involvement is to make use of the sheep for his own ends -he is a hireling, a pretender- in the enterprise of leadership for what he can exploit and use (Perkins 366).

3.3.4 Jesus: The Messianic Good Shepherd 10:14-18

,egw eimi ~o poimhn ~o kaloj(kai ginwskw ta ema(kai ginwskomai upo tw/n emw/n) kaqwj ginwskei me ~o pathr(kagw ginwskw ton patera kai thn yuchn mou tiqhmi upper tw/n probatwn) kai alla probata ecw a ouk estin ek thj aulhj tauthj kakeina me dei agagein(kai thj fwnh/ mon akousousi kai genhsetai mia poimn(eis poimhn) dia touto ~o pathr me agapa/(oti egw tiqhmi thn yuchn mou ina palin labw authn oudeij airei authn ap , emou all, egw tiqhmi authn ap emautou/) exousian ecw qeinai

authn(kai exousian ecw palin labein authn tauthn thn entolhn elabon para tou/ patroj mou (The Interlinear Bible).

> I am the good shepherd; I know my own and my own know me, as the Father knows me and I know the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep. And I have other sheep that are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will heed my voice. So there shall be one flock, one shepherd. For this reason, the Father loves me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again; this charge I have received from my Father.

Following the contrast between the unfaithful hireling and the true protector of the flock, Jesus again repeats, "I am the good shepherd" (v. 14). This not only places weight on the sacrificial theme already established, but shifts the "atmosphere to one of mutuality – and of limitless, self-giving love." The image of the Good Shepherd moves beyond general agrarian familiarity to christological knowledge and faith. The "I am" aphorism of "I am the good shepherd" must be surveyed with all its Johannine counterparts. As with the other "I am" statements, within "I am the good shepherd" Jesus is "identifying himself with God - as God."

This Christological announcement (along with all the other Johannine "I am" statements) expresses a theme of "mutual knowledge" which is based on experience. Jesus' relationship with the Father becomes the paradigm for his relationship with the disciples. Kelly and Moloney call the Johannine Christological experiential discipleship "the enfolding circle of communion" (126) - together with the Father, the "self-sacrificing Son", and the disciple - in eschatological embrace - looking beyond to the fullness of futurity, where the "other sheep" will inhabit "one flock with one shepherd" (v. 16). Practically, Johannine

Christological discipleship fixes on the unity between Father and Son, and seeks to mirror that unity within the community that gathers around Jesus, i.e. the "I am" phrase should have the effect of unifying Jesus' followers (McKenzie 141).

There are reasons to believe that Jesus is the “Good Shepherd”. First, Jesus knows His sheep, and they know Him. There is an intimate knowledge between Jesus and His sheep. He keeps His mind upon them, looking after them by His Spirit and caring for them through intercession as well as by companionship. This is proof that He is the “Good Shepherd” of the sheep. The sheep know Him, His life, His being, His all.

Second, Jesus knows the Father, the Owner of the sheep. The question naturally arises, how well does He know Him? According to Moltmann, one thing is of critical importance. When Jesus claims to know the Father, He does not mean that He knows God in the same sense as other men know Him, “Just as the Father knows me and I know the Father … and I lay down my life for the sheep” (10:15). How well does God know any man? However well God knows Jesus, that is how well Jesus knows God (303). God of course, knows every man perfectly, knows everything there is to know about a person. Therefore, Jesus knows the Father perfectly, just as God knows everything about Him. Jesus and “the Father are one” (v. 30). There is a perfect, intimate knowledge and relationship between them. This is exactly what Jesus was claiming. He was claiming to be “the Good Shepherd”, the very One sent by God to be the Good Shepherd of the sheep. The proof is that He knows the Father even (as well) as the Father knows Him (307).

Third, Jesus will die for the sheep. He was the “Good Shepherd”, not a bad shepherd, therefore, He would face the enemy of the sheep. He would not run away from His calling and purpose. He would stand and fight the enemy as the Good Shepherd was sent to do. Jesus did not say that he would fight and protect the sheep. He said He would die for the sheep – definitely die. He knew that death awaited Him, that His purpose was to die for them.

Jesus dropped the imagery of the shepherd in this statement. He no longer said, "the good shepherd lays down His life" (v.11), He now said "I lay down my life for the sheep" (307).

Fourth, Jesus worked to enlarge the fold, "the sheep pen". The other sheep was a reference to worldwide evangelism. It referred to all believers who were not standing there with Him. It included all countries, races and generations. For there is no difference between Jew and Gentile – the same Lord is Lord of all and richly blesses all who call on him (Rom 10:12). The words, "I have other sheep" is a close, intimate term. The closest bond and fellowship imaginable, a Spirit-filled and supernatural relationship were to exist between Christ and these future sheep.

The word "must" "διε" means necessity, constraint. Jesus was compelled to reach the other sheep. The future sheep were to become sheep of His by "listening to His voice". There is to be one flock, not two flocks. Every believer becomes a part of the Good Shepherd's flock. Note that there are not several shepherds and several flocks. There are not even two shepherds and two flocks. There is only one shepherd and one flock, and that is the flock of the Good Shepherd, of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. The very fact that Jesus enlarges the sheep pen is proof that He is the Good Shepherd. He is the Good Shepherd in that He works and labours for both the Owner and the sheep. He works to keep the sheep healthy so that they will reproduce and increase the flock. An enlarged and healthy flock, of course, means a pleased Owner (the Father) (Carson 511).

The final proof that Jesus is the "Good Shepherd" is His sacrificial death and resurrection. A shepherd could do no greater "good" than to give his life for his sheep. A shepherd who died for his sheep was beyond question a good shepherd. But there is something else here as well. According to Perkins, the owner was pleased, deeply appreciative that the shepherd gave his life for the flock. The owner counted the shepherd to be a "good" shepherd. Jesus made two revealing points. First, His sacrificial death was the

very reason God loves His Son so much. Of course, this does not mean that God does not love His Son just because of who He is. God naturally loves His Son just as any man loves his child. But God loves Jesus even more, in a much more special and profound way, because Jesus was willing to pay such a price to bring men to God. He took the sin of man upon Himself to free man from sin, "He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, so that we might die to sin and live for righteousness, by his wounds you have healed" (1Pet 2:24).

Second, His death was the supreme act of obedience. It was voluntary, He willingly died. No man took His life, He sacrificed it Himself. The critical point: this "command" "την εντολην" to die was of God. This gives a higher meaning to the death of Jesus than just meeting man's need. It means that Jesus did not just die because of sin but because He wished to glorify and honour God. He wished above all else to show His love and adoration for God (491). According to Kasper, this is an aspect of Jesus' death that is often overlooked – "an aspect that arises far above the mere meeting of our need. For in giving Himself as an "offering to God", Christ was looking beyond our need to the majestic responsibility of glorifying God" (207). This means that His first purpose was the glory of God. He was concerned primarily with doing the will of God, with obeying God. God had been terribly dishonoured by the first man, Adam, and by all those who followed after him. Jesus Christ wished to honour God by showing that at least one man thought more of God's glory than anything else. Jesus wished to show that God's will meant more than any personal desire or ambition which He might have. He said: "but the world must learn that I love the Father and that I do exactly what my Father has commanded me [to die for man]" (209).

The "I am" phrases generate "a centripetal effect", bringing believers into relationship with each other by emphasizing and strengthening their mutual relationship to Jesus. This centripetal effect is also evident in Jesus' "voice" (φωνη - *sound or spoken word).* (v.16). While φωνη can also mean "an address as to a group of people, a speech" its origin or root

meaning, φημι - "to enlighten" or "to shine" or "to illuminate." From this source (φημι) the connotation is, Jesus' Johannine "voice" allows for the contextual notion that φωνη can mean "disclosure" or "revelation" through an address, speech or message (213).

"For this reason, the Father loves me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again" (v. 17). Unstated echoes of John 3:16 come to light as Jesus "lays down" his life for "the one emerging flock," loved by the Father who himself "so loved the world" in a cherished and unconditional deed of self-giving - the only salvific foundation. The last article of the verse, is what Carson refers to as, a ″purpose clause*:* Jesus lays down his life "in order to" take it up again." Kelly and Moloney, while resonating with Carson's "purpose and authority" (v. 17), observe the profound mutual embrace of Father and Son. The life that Jesus "takes up" arises and surges from "the loving intention of the Father animating every aspect of his mission." For that reason, Jesus is not condemning himself to the possibility of an unknown progression of malevolent and odious actions beyond his or his Father's command (219). On the contrary, Jesus and the Father are united - "mutually embraced" - in the work of saving humanity. On the other hand, Jesus submits to the Father's will when He lays down His life for His sheep (v. 18).

Brown holds that Jesus concludes this teaching by revealing more fully the mystery involved in the shepherd's laying down his life for the sheep (vv. 17-18). He says he lays down his life *of my own accord* (literally, "from myself,"), which makes it clear that his life is not simply taken from him by his opponents. At no point in this Gospel are his actions determined by human agenda, and his death will be no different. It may look like the triumph of darkness over light, but it is not. Pilate may think he has the authority (19:10, *exousia*, "power"), but Jesus tells him, "You would have no power (*exousia*) over me if it were not given to you from above" (19:11). This does not mean that the human agents of God's power,

both Pilate and Caiaphas, are without sin (19:11) but rather that there is an antinomy between divine sovereignty and human responsibility (211).

Jesus' statement that he has the power to lay down his life stretches the imagery of the shepherd. He next proceeds to transcend it altogether by saying he has the authority not only to lay down his life, but also to take it back again. This cryptic teaching will become clearer in the next chapter of the Gospel, when he speaks of resurrection. The theme of life has been central throughout John's Gospel, and soon it will be the focus of the climax of Jesus' public ministry in the raising of Lazarus (Jn 11). The abundant life that this shepherd has come to give (v. 10) is something far beyond anything ever before available. Those in the story cannot even begin to grasp what he is talking about.

Despite this talk about having authority and acting from himself, the hallmark of his life is dependence on the Father. So he concludes by grounding all that he has said in this truth (v. 18). In laying down his life and taking it back he is obeying his Father. He knows his Father's voice and obeys, just as we are to hear his voice and obey (Beasley 231).

It is in this light that we must understand his statement that “the reason my Father loves me is that I lay down my life - only to take it up again” (v. 17). This statement seems to imply that the Father's love is based on the Son's obedience, but it is clear that the Father's love for the Son is from all eternity (17:24; cf. 3:35; 5:20; 15:9; 17:23, 26). Furthermore, the Father loves the world, which is certainly not obedient (3:16), so the Father's love is not conditioned by obedience.

Some commentators like Carson and Barret resolve this problem by looking at the character of the love between the Father and the Son and concluding that it is "eternally linked with and mutually dependent upon the Son's complete alignment with the Father's will and his obedience even unto death" (Barrett 377). Others point to the effects of the obedience, either in terms of its revelation of the love between the Father and the Son (Bultmann 384) or

in terms of its accomplishment of the salvation of the world. Schnackenburg says the Father's love for the Son is mentioned here "to throw the Son's deed into relief" (301).

3. 4 THE THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF JOHN 10:1-18

In other passages of the Fourth Gospel the evangelist speaks of Jesus on two levels—the below and the above (1:13; 51)—which many listeners did not understand and which tended to separate the true seeker from the mildly curious or the downright hostile. John 10:1-6 is one more example. Here Jesus contrasts the care a true shepherd gives to the sheep with a "thief or bandit" who climbs over the wall of the sheepfold. Although this audience understood sheepherding, they did not get the point.

In verse 6 the author calls this a "figure of speech" or riddle. This riddle is an allegory where each part symbolizes something in real life. The only ones who "follow" Jesus are his disciples, some of whom he will name (v 3), such as Martha, Mary, and Lazarus, whom we will meet in chapter eleven. After he leads the sheep out of the fold, he goes ahead of them (v 4). He will be the first to suffer and die. Those who climb over the wall are the antithesis of faithful shepherds—the Pharisees from 9:40-41 to whom he was still speaking—who did not care for the sheep nor listen to the shepherd's voice.

So, Jesus puts himself into the picture, first as the gate to the sheepfold, offering life in abundance (vv7-10), and then as the shepherd (vv11-18). One wonders who he means by "all who came before me are thieves and bandits" (v 8). Is he referring to the number of would-be messiahs who preceded him? Or the sordid history of high priests after the Maccabean Revolt who bought the office with bribes and only cared for their own power and wealth? The cruelties of the Herodian rulers? The present collection of high priests, Sadducees, and Pharisees who maintain control over the temple system? All of the above? (Soren, 56). But it is most likely that he was referring remotely to the bad shepherds of

Ezekiel's day and proximately to the Scribes and Pharisees of his day. This theme will be treated in chapter five of this work.

Jesus then names himself as the shepherd, the "good shepherd" who lays down his life for the sheep (10:11-18). How is Jesus "good"? There are two common Greek words for "good": kaloj and agaqoj. According to Neyrey, a New Testament social context scholar, agaqoj belongs to the realm of ethics and virtue, but kaloj to the cultural world of honor and shame. Kaloj, used here, is better translated as "noble" or "honorable" (180-184).

Jesus is a noble shepherd because he knows and cares for his sheep, and he repeatedly stresses that he will lay down his life for them (vv 11,15,17,18). Because this nobility is linked with death, Neyrey looks at ancient Greek funeral orations for military heroes for insight into Jesus' meaning. For example, the noble shepherd contrasts with the hired hand who runs away when the wolf comes. With "courage" he will fight the wolf even at the cost of his life (vv 12,13) The noble shepherd "knows his sheep" and treats them fairly (v 14).

Jesus continually stresses the *voluntary nature of his death*. Like noble warriors in battle, Jesus does not flee from danger. "No one takes (my life) from me, but I lay it down of my own accord" (18). This concurs with the account of Thucydides, the Greek historian who writes of soldiers who "chose their fate." Because their deaths were seen as voluntary, they were not victims. "In the logic of honor, they are judged undefeated" (Neyrey 181). Since such a death benefitted others, it was praised as a noble death and worthy of posthumous honors.

According to Brown, the main points made about the christology of John related to the shepherd discourse include the following: The Shepherd represents care, closeness, ownership, transparency, normal relationship, conserving unity of the flock/bringing together, feeding sheep and tending them or providing for their well-being, preserving/protecting/defending. The Shepherd is door that provides passage, entrance, access, safety, and gives abundant life and in the event of danger, the Shepherd lays down his life for the sheep. The mutuality of knowledge about the fact that Jesus the Shepherd lays down his life for the sheep creates the unity of the universal flock or covenant community. Central to these issues is that Jesus has control over his destiny as determined by the divine initiative (213).

It has been noted that chapter 10 holds the last Johannine public teachings of Jesus. It appears that as the author of John records Jesus' teaching on the "good shepherd" he aggregates all the key premises of his gospel at this point, and he does so via a means that culminates at the cross of Calvary and the vicarious atonement realized and completed by Jesus (Harrelson 921). If we do not find our identity in Jesus, the crucified Shepherd, if we do not embrace his true leadership and engage in discipleship that mirrors the unity between Father and Son, and again, seek to mirror that unity in the community that gathers around Jesus - we will end up missing his "voice", unable to find the "door" to safety and liberty that allows us to move eschatologically between this world and the next. We will be alone and likely prey. But the good news is, the Good Shepherd offers a better option. However, the Good Shepherd's offer comes at a cost, both to him and to us (922).

CHAPTER FOUR

HERMENEUTICAL INTERPOLATION OF JOHN 10:1-18 AND THE CHALLENGES OF LEADERSHIP IN NIGERIA

The Good Shepherd model of leadership has continued to find its central position in the discussion that unravels in this research. The Shepherd discourse has persistently sought to de-construct our mental understanding of the essence of leadership and how best it can be practised for the greater result adapting the imagery of the Shepherd.

4.1 THE GOOD SHEPHERD DISCOURSE AND THE LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE OF THE JOHANNINE COMMUNITY

Recent interpretation of the Fourth Gospel agrees that the puzzle (*paroimia*) is addressed primarily to the Pharisees who in the Fourth Gospel belong to the leadership cadre of Israel. They were Jesus' antagonists throughout the section under discussion. It was to them that the cure of the man congenitally blind was reported (9:13). They had the authority to interview the parents of the man and eventually had the authority to expel or throw out the man from the Synagogue (9:18-19,34). In the words of Beasley-Murray, this attitude counteracted the caring disposition exhibited by Jesus towards the man (168). He further asserted that beyond this the discourse probably addressed the general attitude of the opponents of Jesus towards power and authority that was characterized by selfishness and violence (169). This could be seen in the Sanhedrin reaction to Jesus' signs as well as in the Roman imperial policy of intimidation and suppression (11:47-49). Both the Jewish leadership and the Roman colonial claims over the people lacked the elements of concern and care demanded of the shepherd. The presentation of Jesus as the Good Shepherd contrasted this attitude. For Ferdinand Hahn, unlike the selfish leaders, both Jewish and Roman, Jesus lays down his life for the sheep. It was here that the discourse took a dramatic turn. By this very act a new definition of leadership was introduced (185).

This new definition of leadership had two goals. One was to contrast the Jesus model of leadership with that of his opponents, and second was to provide a new leadership orientation for the followers of Jesus. For Hahn, the reason for this alternative leadership

approach could be located within the Johannine community itself. Apart from debates with the leadership of the local Synagogues on the legitimacy of Jesus, internal squabbles and leadership problems had started to emerge. The Johannine Letters present an image of a community in crisis with community leaders locked in bitter exchange of words and mutual insults (2Jn 10; 3Jn 9) (207).

It was likely that the image of Jesus as the Good Shepherd became necessary to remind the leaders what the ultimate goal of the Christian leadership was all about. Christian leaders should not model themselves after the leadership style of the opponents of Jesus, but after the Good Shepherd who gave himself for the welfare of the sheep. And in circumstances of the moment, this is what Nigerian leaders should seriously consider as they present themselves for leadership at various levels. This is because what is obtainable now leaves much to be desired. Nigerian leaders have almost always shown how little they care for their people, not less, sacrifice for them. Selfishness must give way to self-giving. The leader must be the shepherd who serves, fully aware of the in-built risk and preparedness of dying for the good of the sheep (Sheen 212).

The response of the Johannine community to this leadership model was reflected in the presentation and description of the functions of the community leader (Jn 21:15-19). The pastoral language that characterized the commissioning of Peter as the authoritative leader of the community testified to this. In place of the leadership model of the opponents of Jesus, characterized by selfishness and violent competition, the community accepted the Good Shepherd model characterized by loving service and self-giving. Thus, Peter's functions were summarized in two basic concepts, *boskein* and *poimainein.* As the *de facto* community leader, he was to tend and feed the community (Brown 511). In other words, his administration of the community was first and foremost to cater for the well-being and protection of the community in all its ramifications. This goes back to the prescriptions of

Ezekiel. Raymond Brown further holds that the exercise of leadership is fundamentally to serve and not to be served. For him "This service is not a mere response to the primordial instinct to dominate, nor a mere demonstration of philanthropy, but service which is motivated by nothing else than love for the people and the community" (512). It is only such a love-motivated service that creates trust. As such, both the leader and the community are bound by love, mutual trust and respect rather than by selfishness, deception and sycophancy. The existence of mutual trust between the leader and the community is important for it is trust that motivates the leader to love those they lead to the point of risking their lives for their sake.

In the Johannine context, it is clear that the prime motivator of love and trust both in the leader and the community is God himself, and it is to him that both the leader and the community belong. Thus, the sheep which Peter is to tend and feed are not his own, but Jesus' and ultimately God's. Hence Peter is not free to do whatever he likes with them, nor does he have any undue advantages over the members of the community. On the other hand, both the leader and the community must have a close relationship with God from whose resource all depend. Consequently, both the leader and the community are bound by common goals and concerns. It is only within this context and understanding that a leader sees his/her function as an assignment from God for the good of the community, and is also recognized as such by them (Eerdman 246).

In this case the designation of the leader (the name he decides to address himself) or the office they occupy is irrelevant provided they perform the designated functions in line with the principles of tending and feeding. That is why Peter is neither addressed with any of the authority-evoking titles like *episkopoj* already known in the New Testament, nor is his leadership style classified as "democracy" or anything else similar or different from it, the parameters of his duties are spelt out in relation to the community (Brown 413). Peter as a

sharer in model of leadership is therefore conscious of his functions rather than being obsessed with the trappings of an office. He knows that his duty is to feed and to tend the community with loving service, which carries with it the readiness to risk his life for their sake. This fact distinguishes the real leader from charlatans, who in deed are thieves, robbers and hirelings. For the Johannine community, leadership means fundamentally loving service which entails self-giving rather than self-seeking. This new definition or understanding of leadership directly contrasts the understanding of that which enthrones the self and seeks its own advantage. This is what the opponents of Jesus did not understand, and what the Johannine community had to learn gradually with time (Beasley-Murray 170).

4.2 HERMENEUTICAL INTERPOLATION AND THE SEMANTICS OF JOHN10:1-18

The following analysis is principally a method dealing with the monologue and discourses of John 10:1-18. By plotting out the clauses and their semantic relationships a clearer understanding of the text comes to the fore. Therefore, the development of the John's ideas and the discourses are traced through his plot and story line. These discussions will look at the markers of cohesion and shift, seeking to investigate what the discourse features reveal about the unity of John 10:1-18. The discourse features that will be taken into account in the following discussions will concentrate on syntax as well as all stylistic and grammatical features. Such features include the following: lexical definitions, literality, that is literal or figurative, figures, discourse boundaries for example shifts in grammatical person and shifts in verb tense-forms, markers of prominence like verbal aspect and redundant pronouns, and lastly markers of cohesion such as personal reference, verbal aspect, various connections and conjunctions (Porter 301). The conjunctions within John 10:1-18 are discussed as they play a prominent role as markers of cohesion in the text. Initially in verses 1-18, the chapter presents the concept of Jesus being the good shepherd. Jesus begins proposing this idea by opening with a figure of speech in verses 1-5 which introduces the

imagery of the door of the sheepfold and the shepherd and the sheep. It becomes evident in verse 6 that His audience failed to understand this figurative language and so this provides Jesus with an opportunity to explain His figure of speech. Therefore verses 6-18 become an extended reflection (Köstenberger 297) of verses 1-5, offering commentary on the figure of speech.

4.2.1 Textual Analysis

1a Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,

1b ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν προβάτων **ἀ**λλὰ ἀναβαίνων

ἀλλαχόθεν ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστὶν καὶ λῃστής·

2 ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας ποιμήν ἐστιν τῶν προβάτων.

3a τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει

3b καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει

3c καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ᾽ ὄνομα

3d καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά.

4a ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πάντα ἐκβάλῃ,

4b ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται

4c καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ,

4d ὅτι οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ·

5a ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν,

5b ἀλλὰ φεύξονται ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ,

5c ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασιν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τὴν φωνήν.

4.2.2 Analytical Commentary John 10:1-5

Looking at the semantic layers in John 10:1-5, as shown in the text, the clause Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν in verse 1 introduces verses 1-5 as a sandwich of semantic layers. That is the negative circumstance in verses 1b and 5 seems to frame the positive situation. The positive semantic layer is therefore sandwiched between the two negative semantic layers. This is a clear illustration of a semantic pattern in the figure of speech, thus indicating logical cohesion.

Chapter 10:1-18 opens with the words Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν which were used by Jesus to articulate His authority, by binding His words to Himself, making them credible and certain. However, it is also probable that the double ἀμήν was employed for literary effect, strengthening the ἀμήν "truly" (Verbrugge 40). Semantic relations of verses 1-5: Levinsohn explains that the Johannine formula Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν in verse 1a introduces the topic or imagery of the gate of the sheepfold and the comparison of the true and false shepherds (13).

Chapter 9 consists of a narrative and a series of discourses while 10:1-18 is a monologue. The solemn double ἀμήν (v. 1a) is employed as a marker of shift providing a distinction and transition from the dialogues in chapter 9 to the monologue in chapter 10 indicating that what is to follow is important (Morris 44) Therefore Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν begins a new literary unit with new content while alluding to a continuation from the previous chapter. The adverbs ἀμὴν ἀμὴν are thus also a maker of cohesion providing a powerful connection to chapter 9 (Bruce 223).

Jesus starts His monologue in the first person singular, λέγω ὑμῖν (v. 1a) and then makes a grammatical shift to the third person indicating the start of a new unit that makes use of figurative speech (Porter 301). The demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος in verse 1b is used emphatically, providing considerable emphasis on 'this' man (i.e., the one not entering

through the gate) being a thief and a robber. Carson also notes that by focusing immediately on the thieves and robbers a conceptual connection with chapter 9 (cf. 9:39-41) is strengthened. The Pharisees are said to be guilty because they say that they see, yet they are spiritually blind. Jesus' immediate reference to the man who is a thief and a robber who enters the sheepfold some other way in 10:1b is an indication that He is referring to the religious leaders, that is, the Pharisees in 9:40. This provides another marker of cohesion between chapter 9 and chapter 10.

In 10:1-5 Jesus employs figurative language concealing the meaning until verse 7c where He tells His audience who the door of the sheep is, and who the shepherd is (v. 11). Here rich imagery is used. Jesus' audience would have understood αὐλήν "sheepfold" to be an open courtyard or an enclosure attached to a house commonly enclosed by a stone wall. These sheepfolds were positioned near a well and were usually protected by a tower (Henry 19). Although the audience was familiar with the pastoral imagery they failed to understand the spiritual meaning (Morris 445). The pronoun ἐκεῖνος in verse 1b is anaphoric, indicating narrative proximity, referring back to ὁ εἰσερχόμενος (Mounce 107).

According to Porter, the unity between verse 1 and 2 is marked by the conjunction δέ in verse 2. The conjunction is used as a contrastive connective linking the two sentences thus indicating the semantic relationship between the two verses (Porter 208). The conjunction δέ is also a marker of cohesion because one whole idea is formed in verses 1-2 by contrasting the one who enters the sheepfold by climbing in some other way with the genuine shepherd who enters the sheepfold through the door. Therefore, the sentence in verse 2 cannot stand alone as an independent sentence but relies on the previous sentence in verse 1b. The semantic nuance of δέ as a contrastive connective also allows for it to be rendered as "yet" or "however" (Young 183).

Further, this contrast is an example of a carefully crafted antithetical parallelism. As a result, ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος in verse 2 provides cohesion with ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος in verse 1b and moves the discourse forward by introducing the shepherd of the sheep as a new character. It is helpful to understand Jesus' use of ποιμήν "shepherd" in the historical context.

Although some nations considered shepherding unclean, shepherding has always been a common profession in Palestine. Shepherds would provide their sheep with food and water. They knew each sheep and if one were to get lost, they would go out and find it. The little lambs that were unable to keep up would be carried by the shepherd, often inside the fold of his outer garment. The shepherd took great care to protect his sheep, sometimes at the risk of his own life. In Scripture God is often referred to as being a shepherd. The shepherd-flock imagery was one of the earliest symbolic images used and is repeatedly used in Scripture to picture both God and Israel's leaders as shepherds (Carnes 2).

Verses 3-4 provide an amplification of the previous verse, thus they build upon the initial idea presented in verse 2. In verse 3 the repetition of the conjunction καί in close succession is used for rhetorical effect, providing cohesion between the clauses. The first καὶ connects the clause, πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει to the personal pronoun τούτῳ in verse 3a, who is the shepherd of the sheep. From here on in verse 3, καί is used to link coordinate phrases together, thus creating cohesion (Robertson 428).

Θυρωρός seems to be without figurative significance, unlike the other characters in figure of speech (Harris 34). But the gatekeeper was likely a hired hand who knew the shepherd and would open the gate for him. This suggests that there were several flocks of sheep in the sheepfold and that the gatekeeper would only open the door for the shepherds to whom the sheep belonged. Therefore, the shepherd called his own sheep from amongst the others within the sheepfold, and they knew his voice. But often times the shepherd would call

a certain sheep by its nickname; this is different as the sheep is now called individually by name, rather than being called collectively (Carson 383).

The sentence in verse 4a starts with the subordinating conjunction ὅταν which controls the verb ἐκβάλη in the subjunctive mood. The use of ὅταν indicates the time of the action. Ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πάντα ἐκβάλη (v. 4a) follows closely after καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά (v. 3d) in thought, illustrating cohesiveness between the two verses (Wallace 669). Further, it is of some significance that the Gospel of John uses the same word ἐκβάλλω in verse 4 as he does in 9:34-35. In 9:34-35 he used the word to describe how the man born blind was thrown (ἐξέβαλον) out of the synagogue, and then we have the contrast of how Jesus has 'brought out' *(*ἐκβάλη) all His own in verse 4a (Whiteacre 256). Here Jesus is showing His audience how the genuine shepherd is different from the religious leaders or the one who is said to be a thief and a robber. The shepherd, that is Jesus, does not cast His sheep out of the sheepfold (9:34) but rather He calls them by name and leads them out (v. 3). This is yet another example of how chapter 10 is closely tied to chapter 9.

In the last phrase of verse 4, the causal conjunction ὅτι together with the reason οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ provides the reason for why the sheep follow the shepherd (Wallace 674). Αὐτοῦ also refers back to the other third person singulars throughout the sentences in verse 3 and verse 4, as well as to the shepherd in verse 2. These contribute to the unity of the pericope.

Jesus uses the term ἀλλότριος to refer to someone who is not known by the sheep, that is to say that they are foreign and alien. These strangers or foreigners have illegal access to the sheep (Thayer 29), render the meaning of ἀλλότριος as one who is foreign, unsuitable and even hostile. Verbrugge explains the implication of ἀλλότριος in the context of verse 5, "that

the Jewish teachers are strangers, disowned by the true flock of God whereas Jesus is the true shepherd, known and followed by the true people of God" (37).

The KJV in verse 5 renders δέ as a transitional conjunction to introduce a shift in thought, while some of the other formal equivalent translations leave it untranslated. Although there is merit in the KJV's rendering of δέ as a transitional conjunction, δέ is more appropriately making a contrast between the shepherd and the stranger. The difference being that the sheep will follow the shepherd but will not follow the stranger, and therefore δέ should be rendered as "but", "however" or "yet". Therefore, δέ does offer a transition from the previous verse because a new character, the stranger is being introduced and therefore there is a shift in thought. But more significantly δέ marks the cohesion between verse 5 and verses 2-4 by contrasting the stranger with the shepherd, which is negative and positive (Young183).

Furthermore, Wallace explains that ἀλλά in verse 5b can also be used as a contrastive conjunction, used in contrasting thoughts (671). The contrast is that the sheep will not follow a stranger but instead they will flee from him. Therefore, the adversative conjunction ἀλλά also forms cohesion in the way of marking the contrast between the two phrases, verses 5a and 5b (Young 180).

The pronoun αὐτοῦ in verse 5b is used to refer back to the stranger in the previous clause (v. 5a). The plural ἀλλοτρίων (v. 5c) also relates back to the singular ἀλλοτρίῳ in verse 5a. These provide coherence within verse 5. In the last clause of verse 5 the conjunction ὅτι indicates the reason that the sheep will flee from the stranger, namely, because the sheep do not know the stranger's voice (190). Again, ὅτι joins the first half (v. 5a-b) of the sentence with the latter half (v. 5c) together in a coherent whole.

Verse 5 then takes the reader back to the idea as laid out in verse 1b and builds upon it. In other words, verse 5 is an amplification of verse 1b. Verses 4-5 are yet another instance of an antithetical parallelism which contrasts ὅτι οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ (v. 4d) with ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασιν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τὴν φωνήν (v. 5a). The concept is that the sheep know the voice of the one who goes before them (v. 4d) but do not know the voice of strangers (v. 5a). Therefore, cohesion is clearly evident between verses 4 and 5. Added to this, contrast is made between the positive situation in verses 3-4 and the negative situation in verse 5.

4.2.3 Semantic Relations in John 10:6-18

6 Ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖνοι **δὲ** οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τίνα ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς,

7a Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

7b Ἀμὴν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν

7c ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων.

8a πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λῃσταί,

8b ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα.

9a ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα:

9b δι᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθη

9c σωθήσεται καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ νομὴν εὑρήσει.

10a ὁ κλέπτης οὐκ ἔρχεται

10b εἰ μὴ ἵνα κλέψῃ καὶ θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ:

10c ἐγὼ ἦλθον

10d ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν.

11a Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός.

11b ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων:

12a ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμήν,

12b οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια,

12c θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον

12d καὶ ἀφίησιν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει

12e καὶ ὁ λύκος ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει

13a ὅτι μισθωτός ἐστιν

13b καὶ οὐ μέλει αὐτῳ περὶ τῶν προβάτων.

14a Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς

14 b καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσί με τὰ ἐμά,

15a καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα,

15b καὶ τὴν ψυχήν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.

16a καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης:

16b κἀκεῖνα δεῖ με ἀγαγεῖν

16c καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσιν,

16d καὶ γενήσονται μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν.

17a διὰ τοῦτό με ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾳ

17b ὅτι ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν μου,

17c ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν.

18a οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ ἐμοῦ,

18b ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ ἐμαυτοῦ.

18c ἐξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι αὐτήν,

18d καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν:

18e ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου.

4.2.4 Analytical Commentary John 10:6-18

Ταύτην is a demonstrative pronoun. Hildebrandt (66) explains demonstratives as pointers, in the case of ταύτην the pronoun is pointing to something near. Thayer describes

the meaning of παροιμία as a proverb, or more specifically as a hidden saying which shadows some moralistic or educational truth, as in a figure of speech or symbolic discourse. This type of speech is employed by the speaker or author to illustrate something by using comparisons, similes and allegory (490). According to Köstenberger, ταύτην τὴν παροιμίαν refers back to the symbolic discourse in verses 1-5 which Jesus spoke to them, creating unity between the previous literary unit and the next (vv. 7-18). Verse 6 is acting as a link, connecting the figure of speech (vv. 1-5) with its further development or extended reflection in verses 7-18. Therefore verse 6 marks out the situation followed by Jesus' response (302).

The conjunction δέ in verse 6 is employed to connect the first half of the sentence with the second half, it is therefore used as a connective word (Porter 208). Further, δέ provides a transition, introducing a new development within the narrative, that is that those around Jesus "had no idea what he was talking about" (183). This misunderstanding sets the grounds for Jesus' expansion of the figure of speech (vv. 1-5) in verses 7-18. In verse 6, ἐκεῖνοι is a remote demonstrative (135) acting as a marker of cohesion between chapters 9 and 10. Wallace explains that ἐκεῖνοι is a third person plural pronoun while also having an anaphoric force, that is, it is referring back to the Jewish leaders in chapter 9 (328). They do not understand Jesus because they are blind (9:40-41) and they are not of His sheep (v. 26), but after Jesus explains Himself and they begin to understand, their understanding forms the basis for the rejection of Jesus. Further τίνα ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς refers back to the symbolic discourse in verses 1-5 (404).

The words Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς in verse 7a point the reader to added items within the narrative which will offer an extended reflection and development of the symbolic discourse found in verses 1-5. It is evident how these words act as a marker of cohesion linking verses 1-6 to the development of the symbolic discourse in verses 7-18, and in this

sense, they are also a marker of continuation. The conjunction οὖν in verse 7a is used in the inferential sense, pointing towards content that will follow, but it also provides an inference from what has preceded, that is, the figure of speech in verses 1-5 which Jesus' audience failed to understand (Morris 449). In addition, the conjunction οὖν acts as a marker of continuation of the narrative and could thus also be translated as "then" (Danker 736). In the same clause, πάλιν "again" acts as a marker suggesting not merely a repetition of the same figure of speech, but it provides an expectation for further development.

According to Köstenberger the double ἀμήν in verse 7b is a distinctive feature in John's Gospel. It is being used here to start a new monologue, that is, an explanation of the preceding figure of speech (vv. 1-5) and is therefore also a continuation thereof (299). In verse 7b, the pronoun ὑμῖν refers back to the Jews or Jewish leaders mentioned in chapter 9 and 10:6, who failed to understand the figure of speech. Therefore, a sense of cohesion is evident between verse 6 and verse 7 and once again because ὑμῖν is referring to the same audience in chapter 9, unity is found between chapter 9 and 10.

Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων (v. 7c) is reiterating the door motif in verse 1b, thus creating unity with the first literary unit in chapter 10. In verse 7c Jesus begins to explain His figurative speech so that it may be understood, that He is the door of the sheep. But Jesus' saying ἐγώ εἰμι which is a characteristic of John's Gospel (the "I am" sayings), has profound significance and implications later in chapter 10. Köstenberger explains that these words are reminiscent of the messianic readings in Psalm 118:20 (303). By using the words ἐγώ εἰμι Jesus was making Himself equal with God. The Jewish leaders understood this full well and their reaction is evident in verses 19-39.

Metzger notes that πρὸ ἐμοῦ in verse 8 was probably added before or after ἦλθον or that it was simply omitted, it is difficult to know for certain. According to Metzger the external evidence is also rather impressive for the shorter textual variation. Therefore, I have chosen to keep the words πρὸ ἐμοῦ after ἦλθον (195). Jesus makes an interesting contrast here. He provides a positive proclamation that He Himself is the door of the sheep (v. 7c) and contrasts it with a negation, that is, all who came before Him are thieves and robbers (v. 8a).

In verse 8 Jesus is likely referring to the shepherds (that is, the leaders) of Israel mentioned in Ezekiel 34:2-4 (and the entire chapter) and possibly even messianic pretenders who came before Jesus. Therefore, πρὸ ἐμοῦ provides a sense of superiority; that is Jesus is superior to those who came before Him; this then is also a reference to time past (Robertson 662). Further, there is an obvious link between πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λῃσταί (v. 8a) and the thief and the robber who climbs into the sheepfold some other way in verse 1b. Secondly, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα in verse 8b is referring back to verse 5. Therefore verse 8 evokes powerful reminiscences from Israel’s political history and Jewish Scripture while also providing cohesive unity between the figure of speech in verses 1-5 and the monologue that follows (Carson 384).

Turner makes an interesting observation. He notes that verse 9 is a connection back to Numbers 27:16-17 where Moses appointed Joshua as a man over the congregation who would go out before them and come in before them, who would lead them out and bring them in, that the congregation of the Lord may not be as a sheep that has no shepherd. Interestingly the Greek form of יהושׁוע (Joshua) is Ἰησοῦς (Jesus) (47).

The clause ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα (v. 9a) is a reiteration of the same phrase found in verse 7c with identical implications. The ancient world would have understood Jesus’ claim to be the “the gate” as it is indicated in Greek literature that the ancients commonly thought that one

entered heaven through a door or a gate. This way of thinking also appears in Jewish literature, notably in the Old Testament and the apocalyptic literature (Köstenberger 303). Therefore, when Jesus claimed to be the door together with the "I am" saying, He was making a very powerful statement that would have resonated with His audience. The repetition of the door motif which is found in the opening verses (vv. 1 and 3) and in verse 7c acts as a marker of cohesion linking the figure of speech with its extended reflection in verses 7-18.

Jesus is the door. He is the only way by which the sheep may enter into the sheepfold, and He is the only way to attain salvation and find spiritual security (Carson 385). In verse 9c Jesus uses σώζω "implying eschatological salvation" which brings people into the eternal kingdom by the forgiveness of sins through the cross (550).

The figurative language of νομὴν εὑρήσει was used commonly in the Old Testament to illustrate God's provision for His sheep (e.g. Psalm 23:2). The imagery was also often used to refer to Israel's deliverance and final restoration (Köstenberger 304). This figurative language can then also be applied to the sheep, because Jesus the Good Shepherd delivers, rescues and restores His sheep.

The noun ὁ κλέπτης in verse 10a refers back to the "thief and a robber" in the previous literary unit (v. 1b), and κλέψῃ καὶ θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ illustrates his purpose, that is, what he has come to do. As with verse 3 the repetition of the conjunction καί in close succession is used for rhetorical effect, providing cohesion between the verbs κλέψῃ, θύσῃ and ἀπολέσῃ (Robertson 428). Köstenberger also explains that the three negative verbs grouped together provide an emphatic illustration of the devastative purpose of the thief towards Jesus' sheep. Verse 10b is therefore an amplification of the idea presented in verse 8a (304).

In verse 10, ἐγώ (v. 10c) makes a shift from ὁ κλέπτης (v. 10a); focusing now on Jesus and His purpose. The conjunction ἵνα together with the subjunctive ἔχωσιν forms a purpose clause. The conjunction also acts as a connection between ἐγὼ ἦλθον and the rest of the sentence unifying the sentence (Young 186). Verbrugge explains the use of ζωήν here as Jesus being "the sources of divine life and power both in the old and new creations". He explains further how Jesus does not only bring eternal life by His word, but that He is true life Himself and therefore gives His people life by His word and by His personhood. And because this life He gives to those who belong to Him is eternal, it is said to be given "to the full" (228). It is evident then that Jesus' purpose as outlined in verse 10 is the alternative, contrasting the purpose why He has come, with the wicked purposes of the thief.

Some readings substitute δίδωσιν in verse 11 with τίθησιν, which is attested by several witnesses. However, the expression "to give one's life" is characteristic of the Synoptic Gospels while "to lay down one's life" is a Johannine stylistic feature (Metzger 196) (cf. John 10:15, 17; 13:37; 15:13; 1 John 3:16). When Jesus talks of Himself as laying down His life for the sheep, He is not only talking about endangering His own life in order to rescue an endangered sheep. But because He loves His sheep, He will die in their place so that they may be saved (Thielman 201).

The "I am" saying is Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός (v. 11) has the same implications as found in verses 7-8. At its strongest, this statement is an identification with God and at its weakest it is a messianic claim (Harris 418). Robertson explains that the emphasis is amplified because there is a repeated article ὁ and an adjective καλός. There is also an absence of a conjunction between ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός and ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς. This grammatical feature is used to make Jesus' statement ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός even more emphatic (429). Jesus is therefore declaring Himself to also be the shepherd spoken of in

verse 2. Therefore, Jesus is saying that He is both the door by which the sheep enter and He is also the good shepherd of the sheep (vv. 1-5). The repetition of the shepherd motif provides the text with a marker of cohesion linking this literary unit with the first. Secondly, verse 11 has an informational structure, that is, it contains a 'topic and comment sequence'. The shepherd theme is established by Jesus when He says, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. The following sentence in the same verse through to verse 18 develops this idea of Jesus being the good shepherd. This then is also a marker of cohesion between verses 1-5, 11-18; 27-28 (Porter 305). Further, in the first sentence of verse 11 Jesus speaks of Himself in the first person singular, Ἐγώ εἰμι and then in the following sentence He makes a grammatical shift to the third person. Although the shepherd in the third person is still referring to Jesus Himself it acts as a sign of shift illustrating that the statement, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός is now being developed further (301).

A new character, ὁ μισθωτὸς is introduced in verse 12. A μισθωτὸς is someone who has no genuine interest in his responsibility and is in fact unfaithful in carrying out his duty and therefore often earned a negative reputation. In this sense the word could be rendered as a "hireling" or a "hired hand" (Carnes 21). The first καί in this sentence is used as a conjunction to contrast the hired hand with the true shepherd, that is to say that the hired hand is *not* the shepherd (189). The pronoun οὗ refers back to μισθωτός; the hired hand is not the owner of the sheep and is unfaithful in his duties. These grammatical features all contribute to the unity of the sentence.

Other signs of cohesion in verse 12 are the conjunctions καί scattered throughout the verse. Apart from the first καί already mentioned, the second καί connects the clause θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον which is the reason with the result, ἀφίησιν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει. The next καί acts as a simple combining additive, combining ἀφίησιν τὰ πρόβατα with φεύγει to

form a single action. The καί which follows, acts as a focusing additive, offering a brief discussion of the wolf's coming and the result; that is, the sheep are dragged away and are scattered. The last καί in the sentence is also a simple combining additive connecting the actions of ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ (snatches) with σκορπίζει (scatters), illustrating that both actions are carried out by the wolf when he comes (Porter 211). As said earlier, Robertson explains that the repetition of the conjunction καί in close succession is used for rhetorical effect, providing cohesion between clauses. The verb ἁρπάζει reveals the hostility the wolf has against the shepherd's sheep by capturing them and taking them by force (74).

The conjunction ὅτι in verse 13 is a sign of cohesion linking verse 12 with verse 13, pointing firstly to the grounds, that the person who flees from the wolf is a hired hand, and then secondly to the reason. The reason for not being concerned about the sheep is because the hired hand has no genuine interest in his responsibility and is in fact unfaithful in carrying it out (Vine 305). Therefore, when the wolf comes, he puts his life above the sheep and flees for safety. This is unlike the shepherd who is willing to put his life in danger for the sake of the sheep (vv. 10-11). Another sign of cohesion is the repetition of the noun μισθωτός in verse 13a from verse 12a; this too links the two verses.

There is an interesting pattern of positive and negative which emerges from verses 9-13. These are amplifications of verses 7c-8. Here the alternating layers of positive negative positive negative provide a strong sense of unity and rhythm within the text, it is almost poetic.

Köstenberger notes that verse 14 continues the distinction between the hired hand and the good shepherd. Jesus reiterates the statement, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς as a marker of shift from the previous subject, the hired hand, making Himself the focus of verse 14.

Secondly, the repetition of the clause acts as a marker of cohesion between the text of this verse and verse 11(306).

The conjunction καί in verse 14b is used as a discourse additive joining the clause Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς with γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ. The conjunction serves to "represent a shift in thought" (188). In verse 11a the audience is told that Jesus Himself is the good shepherd and that He lays down His life for the sheep, but in verse 14b the audience is now also told that He actually knows His own sheep. The second conjunction καί serves to link the clause γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ with γινώσκουσί με τὰ ἐμά thus maintaining the line of plot (Young 188). Whitacre explains that the conjunction καθώς in verse 15a is usually used as a comparative. However here it is also used in the causal sense which expresses the reason for the action of the Father knowing Jesus (262).

In verse 15a, γινώσκω is used similarly in verse 14b thus representing a mutual inner fellowship between God the Father and God the Son, this knowledge is in harmony and is perfectly complete (Verbrugge 109). The idea between verses 14b and 15a is the vertical relationship between Jesus and his own (the sheep) as illustrated in verse 14b in comparison with verse 15b which is at a higher horizontal level. This is represented by the unique relationship between Jesus, God the Son and God the Father. The conjunction κἀγώ links the clause καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ with γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα demonstrating that the relationship is mutual (188). The last conjunction καὶ in verse 15b provides an added thought, the idea of Jesus laying down His life for the sheep, τὴν ψυχήν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων in verse 15b was first proposed in verse 11b. Therefore, unity between verses 11 and 15 is clearly evident.

Jesus' identification as the door of the sheep (v. 7c) and the Good Shepherd (v. 11a) finds partial conclusion in verse 16, while it continues the idea of verse 15, verse 16 follows

through on the concluding remarks in verses 17-18 (Ridderbos 351). The first conjunction καί in verse 16a is being used as a focusing additive, illustrating another subject being added to the discourse; an addition of more sheep, other than the original, to the sheepfold. Although a new subject (other sheep) is being introduced, it is in addition to the sheep that the good shepherd already has, and thus this verse forms a connection to the previous verses where His original sheep are mentioned (Danker 46).

In verse 16a the demonstrative pronoun ταύτης is being used to refer to something close in proximity, the other sheep, and is translated as "these" (Mounce 107). Therefore, ταύτης provides coherence between the first half of the sentence prior to ταύτης and the next two clauses. Verse 16b which reads κἀκεῖνα δεῖ με ἀγαγεῖν is an inference from verse 16a and thus cohesion is maintained between the two parts. The second καί found in verse 16c is used as a simple additive, joining the first half of the sentence with τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσιν. The third καί in verse 16d on the other hand links the previous clause with the ultimate purpose γενήσονται μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν (Young 188). Thus, all the sheep are gathered, the original sheep and the sheep still to be called out, and they will become one flock under one shepherd. Verbrugge explains the imagery of ποιμήν as "the sum total of his sheep" standing before Him. Jesus, the Good Shepherd gathers all His flock to Himself, uniting both Jews and Gentiles alike into one flock (481). John 11:49-52 also illustrates this idea clearly, that Jesus would gather into one, the children of God who are scattered abroad (Neyrey 288). Therefore verses 14b-16 provides an amplification of verse 14a.

It is difficult to know in verse 17 whether διὰ τοῦτό (v. 17a) is anaphoric or whether the result is provided in the next clause. However, because the purpose is provided in the antecedent as well as in the next clause, I argue that both are true in the context of this verse. The idea being that as a result of Jesus, the Good Shepherd laying down His life for His sheep

in verse 15b and gathering them into one flock (v. 16), the Father loves Him. Therefore, there is cohesion between verse 17 and verses 15-16 (Ridderbos 365). Yet the next clause ὅτι ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν μου in verse 17b also reiterates the reason why the Father loves the good shepherd (v. 17a). The conjunction ὅτι is employed to point the reader to the reason and therefore unity is evident between the verse 17a and 17b (Young 190). It seems appropriate then to indicate that verse 17b is perhaps the primary reason for the result found in verse 17a.

The conjunction ἵνα + the subjunctive λάβω (v. 17c) form a purpose clause rather than providing a reason why Jesus lays down His life (Köstenburger 307). This too links πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν with the previous clause. Carson explains that ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν μου refers to Jesus' sacrificial death and that πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν refers to His resurrection. Therefore, the conjunction ἵνα as Carson explains, demonstrates to John's audience that Jesus' death was not an end in itself nor was His resurrection an afterthought. Rather Jesus' resurrection was in view at His crucifixion. Jesus died so that He could rise and be ultimately glorified and pour out His Spirit upon the church and give life, eternal life, to His sheep (388). Therefore, Jesus' death would not ultimately be a tragedy brought about by others, but rather it was in accordance with the Father's will and the authority given to Jesus by His Father.

In verse 18 the pronoun αὐτήν is referring back to verse 17, to Jesus' life which He intends to lay down for the sake of His sheep. Therefore, αὐτήν acts as a sign of cohesion between verses 17-18. Verse 18a οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ ἐμοῦ provides an inference from verse 17b, thus maintaining coherence between the two verses. The conjunction ἀλλά in verse 18b indicates a contrast of thought between οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ ἐμοῦ and ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ ἐμαυτοῦ (Wallace 671), the idea being that no one is able to take Jesus' life from Him, but that He lays it down freely as an act of active obedience (Grudem 570). Therefore, ἀλλά is a marker of cohesion between the verse 18a and 18b. The clauses, ἐξουσίαν ἔχω

θεῖναι αὐτήν (v. 18c) and καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν (v. 18d) refers back to verse 17b-c ὅτι ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν μου (reason), ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν (purpose) thus providing unity between verses 17 and 18. The meaning of ἐξουσίαν is significant because not only does Jesus have ruling power and authority to do as He wills, but rather ἐξουσίαν is used here to refer to Jesus' absolute freedom within this power and authority to be a servant to humanity and therefore His authority and power is not used towards forcible domination (Verbrugge 192).

The pronoun ταύτην in verse 18e is a continuative, that is, the topic of discussion is continued by ταύτην. The topic being that Jesus is to freely lay down His life for His sheep and then raise it up again. Therefore, the use of ταύτην in this sense is anaphoric because it is addressing what precedes the pronoun and refers to what is near (Robertson 697). Indeed, verse 18e provides the reason for verses 17b to 18d which in turn is an amplification of Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς in verse 14a.

4.3 THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD

Jesus called himself the Good Shepherd. When he said this, his audience probably knew well the role of a shepherd. In the text of John 10:1-18, certain qualities, attributes and disposition of the Shepherd are exposed. In the text under consideration and in the Bible generally, sheep and shepherds are referred to with great frequency. Sometimes, the Bible talks about real sheep and real shepherds. Other times, it compares God's people to sheep and the leaders of God's people as shepherds. Only Jesus speaks of Himself as the Good Shepherd. What is it about Jesus that makes him refer to himself as such? Theilman proposes eight attributes of the Good Shepherd which the researcher would discuss here.

The attributes or qualities of the Good Shepherd as would be discussed here will also be considered as the challenges of leadership. These challenges are drawn after the

pattern of the Good Shepherd and leaders who fall short of them truly miss the mark. Leaders who fail to follow this model are challenged *ipso facto* by the Good Shepherd exemplary life. Leaders are predisposed to neglect the model of the shepherd due to their natural disposition as human beings. But again, there are challenges of leadership that emanate from the external forum based on the vicissitudes that the leader encounters in leadership. While in the former, the personal qualities of the leader are examined, the latter deals with social, economic, religious and political climate the leader finds himself.

First, Boundaries: Jesus the Shepherd knew the boundary of his relation with his flock. Stepping over those boundaries damages or destroys the relationship. A true leader will establish and maintain boundaries. For the shepherd there is a sheep pen within which only his sheep may gather. “In truth I tell you, anyone who does not enter the sheepfold through the gate, but climbs in some other way, is a thief and a robber (10:1-2). For leaders in every area of life, there are appropriate ethical and moral boundaries that leaders need to establish and maintain for the benefit of those they lead. Jesus exemplified this in the Discourse and sets it as an essential leadership quality.

Second, Example: The shepherd goes on ahead of the sheep, and his sheep follow him. “He who enters through the gate is the shepherd of the flock, the gatekeeper lets him in, the sheep hear his voice, one by one he calls his own sheep and leads them out” (10:3-4). Jesus, by virtue of his leadership commands followership because he leads by example. Leaders must be worthy models to follow.

The third quality is Trustworthiness. Sheep follow the good shepherd “because they know his voice” (10:4). This was learned over time from the consistent and caring treatment of the shepherd toward the sheep. A leader needs to cultivate a deep sense of trust from those

he or she leads. This is a quality where one's voice speaks volumes about the character and care of a leader.

Fourth, Provision: A shepherd provides good pasture (10:9). A sheep says of the shepherd (Psalm 23)

"I shall not be in want.

He makes me lie down in green pastures,

He leads me beside quiet waters,

He restores my soul."

Jesus, the noble shepherd provides for his flock. True leaders provide for the needs of those they lead. For instance, they do not grind down their employees in unhealthy environments at less than livable wages. They do not fire them without caring about what happens to them. They do not ignore to pay the salaries of their workers. When it comes to a leadership choice, a person is more important than a profit. A leader acts in a way that gives "life" to those he or she leads (10:10).

Fifth, Sacrificial: Five times Jesus speaks about laying down his life for the sheep (10: 11, 15, 17-18). This shepherd chose personal sacrifice for the welfare of his sheep. So it is with true leaders. They willingly experience personal sacrifice for the benefit of those they lead. It's not about the leader; it is about those they lead.

Sixth, Invested: The shepherd has a personal stake in the well-being of the sheep. A hired hand will abandon them when the going gets tough or dangerous – for him, it is only a job. The shepherd is invested in the sheep and sticks with them through thick and thin (10:12). So it is with true leaders. They are personally invested in those they lead.

Seventh, Relational: “I know my sheep and my sheep know me” (10:14). The true leader takes the time and energy to build solid and genuine relationships with those he or she leads. Those led are not viewed as mere employees, servants, or objects; each is known and treated as an “image of God” with respect and dignity.

Eighth, Visionary: Jesus moved toward increasing the size of his flock – those who would become his genuine followers (10:16). True leaders have a vision for the future and move toward it. They are pro-active in thoughts and actions (325).

4.4 THE GOOD SHEPHERD LAYS DOWN HIS LIFE FOR HIS SHEEP

Jesus says, “I am the good shepherd” (v. 11), an "I am" saying that, like the others, ultimately concerns the issue of life. He has just promised life “to the full” (v. 10), and he now says this life comes through his death (vv. 11, 15, 17-18). Once again he starts with a familiar image in his audience's life, since shepherds commonly had to deal with the problem of wild animals (cf. Gen 31:39; 1 Sam 17:34-37). A good shepherd, one who is noble and worthy of admiration (kalos*),* would risk his life to protect the sheep. For Jeremias, Jesus does not merely risk his life; he consciously gives his life for the sake of his sheep (vv. 15, 17-18; cf. (496).

According to Jeremias (496) and Barret (374) the idea of a voluntary and vicarious death for the sheep is not found in the Old Testament nor elsewhere. The closest conceptual background is that of the suffering servant of Isaiah 53 (Brown (398). While this servant is likened to a sheep rather than a shepherd (Is 53:7), it is said of him "the Lord makes his life a

guilt offering" (Is 53:10). The expression in John 10, “lays down his life” egw tiqhmi thn yuchn mou *(tithemi ten psychen),* could be taken as a translation of "makes his life" (Is 53:10; (Jeremias 710). For the sheep (*hyper ton probaton)* does not in itself necessarily speak of sacrifice, but in John it does (Barrett 375). In every place the preposition *hyper* "for" is used in John (6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:50-52; 13:37-38; 15:13; 17:19; 18:14), with two exceptions (1:30; 11:4), it is used of sacrifice in which "the death envisaged is on behalf of someone else" (Carson 386). So again, Jesus' death is seen to be central to his task.

Another part of the conceptual background comes from the prophet Zechariah, who contrasts two shepherds. One is the messianic shepherd-king who is rejected by the people, which, in turn, results in their condemnation (Zech 11:4-14). The second is the worthless shepherd who deserts the flock (Zech 11:4-17). God's messianic shepherd will be struck down, causing the sheep to be scattered and leading to the judgment and refining of God's people (Zech 13:7-9). This rejection by the leaders of the people and their own condemnation is echoed in John, as is the striking of the shepherd, though with a different effect. It will indeed lead to the scattering of Jesus' flock for a brief time, but it will also be central in the gathering of his own flock from among the nations: "But I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself" (Jn 12:32).

This death makes him the shepherd that is “good” (kaloj). This word refers in such a context to that which is beautiful, noble, honorable, worthy of praise as treated in the early part of this work. In other words, Jesus is fulfilling his job as a shepherd in an exemplary fashion so that such goodness is able to be perceived (Grundmann 548). He is the admirable shepherd, and there is something admirable, heroic and attractive in his death. Consequently, it is in his death that he will draw all men to himself (12:32). The beauty of the Lord's

character attracts those whose hearts are able to receive divine beauty. This is far more than an admirable death of a martyr. For in this death we see the beauty of God himself, since God is love, and love, as John says (1 Jn 3:16), is the laying down of life, for one has no greater love than he lays down his life for his friends. It is precisely because he was in the form of God that he poured himself out and laid down his life (Phil 2:6-8) (Moule 97). In Jesus we see the divine character, and what we see is beautiful. When we are able to really see God as Jesus has revealed him we cannot help praising him if we have hearts that are open to God. Such a vision of God's beauty is at the heart of all true worship.

Jesus goes on to contrast the shepherd who will risk his life for the sheep with a hireling who runs from the wolf and leaves the sheep behind to be attacked '*arpazei* (harpazei*,* literally, "snatched" or "carried off") and scattered. They are not his sheep, and he does not care about them (Jn 10:12-13). This picture is not so much an allusion of Ezekiel 34 as a development from it. In Ezekiel the danger from wild animals arises after the sheep have been scattered (Ezek 34:5, 8), and the false shepherds are indeed shepherds, though like the hireling they care nothing for the sheep. So, there are some general associations with Ezekiel, which may suggest that Jesus is continuing his condemnation of the leadership of Israel. But the main point seems to focus on the character of the Good Shepherd, specifically, his care for the sheep (Reid 101).

His care for the sheep addresses two problems, the lack of care on the part of the hireling and the threat of scattering by the wolf. Elsewhere the wolf is an image of false teachers who come both from outside the community and from within (Mt 7:15; Acts 20:29-30). Such a problem was present in John's day in Ephesus, since Paul's prediction to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:29-30) was already coming to pass in Paul's own day (cf. 1 Tim 1:3) and continued in John's time (cf. 1 John). Likewise, the problem of hirelings continued in the

church, as seen in Peter's exhortation to the elders to shepherd God's flock willingly and not just for money (1 Pet 5:2).

The themes introduced in a general way (Jn 10:11-13) are then personalized and developed (10:14-18). According to Wallace, Jesus' knowledge of his flock and their knowledge of him (v. 14) are compared to the knowledge the Father and the Son have of one another (v. 15). The conjunction translated “just as”(*kaqoj*) is most often used as a comparative, but it can have a causal sense (674). Both senses are true here, for "the relationship between God the Father and his Son is the original model and reason for Jesus' fellowship with his own" (Schnackenburg 297). As always, Jesus' identity as the Son and his relationship with the Father are crucial for understanding what is being said.

This knowledge is not simply a knowledge about one another or merely the knowledge of an acquaintance. Rather, it is an intimacy that is love. The intimacy of the Father and the Son is so close it is described as a oneness (10:30), and a similar oneness of life is affirmed between Jesus and his disciples (for example, 15:1-7). The believer is not stirred into some cosmic soup, as in false forms of mysticism, but rather there is a radical oneness that does not obliterate the distinctness of the person (Brown 271). As the holy Trinity is both One and Three, so the believer is one with God and yet distinct from God. This theme of intimacy has been introduced earlier, for example in Jesus' teaching that his followers must eat his flesh and drink his blood (Jn 6:53-57), and it will be unpacked in detail in the discourse in the upper room (chaps. 13—17). Its inclusion here provides important clarification regarding the nature of the new community Jesus is bringing into existence. This closeness includes the most intimate of relations between Jesus and each of his followers, and it is part of the union with God that they enter into in Christ through membership in his flock (273).

According to Keener, this new community is based on his death (10:15). The very pattern of life in this new community is that of life laid down for one another, a cruciform life. The possibility of such a life and the power for such a life come through the life of the Son of God poured out on the cross, thereby uniting God and mankind by taking away the sin of the world and revealing the glory of God (343).

Before revealing more about his death, Jesus mentions that he has other sheep not of this sheep pen who must be brought also, so "there shall be one flock and one shepherd" (v. 16). The most natural reading, accepted by most commentators, is that Jesus is referring to sheep from outside the fold of Judaism. There are Gentiles who will listen to his voice and be joined to his flock. Thus, in this section that speaks of Jesus' founding a community apart from official Judaism, Jesus himself speaks to one of the greatest points of controversy in the earliest church. He does not clearly specify on what terms the Gentiles are to be included, and so the church later had to discern his will whether or not Gentiles must become converts to Judaism in order to join his flock. But the present context, which describes a follower who has been expelled from the synagogue, hints at the answer. Most recent scholars think John is simply giving Jesus some lines that would address the later situation, but the potential ambiguity of the figure is typical of Jesus himself, cf. 21:22-23 (Kasper 583).

They are already his sheep because they have been given to him by the Father (v. 16; cf. 10:29; 6:37-39; 17:2, 6, 24 (Beasley-Murray 171), yet they must hear his call and respond. So once again we see both divine sovereignty and human responsibility at play. In saying that he must *bring them also* he speaks of the love that goes in search of the lost, which is a theme running throughout this Gospel and indeed the New Testament. He *must (dei)* do this; it is a divine necessity (Grundmann 24) that comes from the very character of God as love.

But how will he bring the Gentiles? When Gentiles do come to him it signals his hour has finally arrived (12:20, 23), but Jesus himself is not seen going to the Gentiles. He will bring the Gentiles into the flock by the ministry of his disciples, whom he will send (20:21). Jesus will continue his own ministry through his people, which will be accomplished through the presence of the Spirit. They are the ones who will bring the Gentiles, but Jesus is saying it is he himself who is doing so. This is an example of the oneness between the shepherd and his flock.

Similarly, the one shepherd unites the flock (Morris 380). The oneness comes from sharing the life of the one God in his Son by his Spirit. This flock is thus a spiritual entity yet not in the sense of being non-historical or only invisible any more than the incarnate Son who is its shepherd is such. This community has identifiable marks as a recognizable entity within history. Several marks are referred to in the New Testament, but the main ones mentioned in this passage are the centrality of Christ, the confession of him as exemplified by the former blind man and the fact that this community is to be composed of both Jews and Gentiles. The centrality of Christ is especially strong, given his exclusivist claims. "The text does not suggest that this Good Shepherd will one day join a series of other shepherds who will then form a cooperative `shepherds' union'" (Bailey 17). Thus, the oneness of the flock corresponds to the thought found throughout this Gospel that Jesus is the only way to the Father.

Each of these efforts touch on Johannine themes, but what does it mean that *the reason* the Father loves the Son is that he lays down his life? The Father simply *is* love (1 Jn 4:8), and as a part of his very character his love is not contingent on the loveliness of the objects of his love. But it is possible to fall out of "the sphere of His active love" (Hoskyns 440), which is the condition of the world upon whom God's wrath abides (3:36). His wrath is his settled opposition toward that which disrupts the harmony of relations between himself

and his creatures and which corrupts and destroys those whom he loves. In the case of Christ, his sinless obedience maintains the harmony of relationship between himself and his Father—therefore God's love remains fulfilled toward him. Jesus refers to this when he says, "If you obey my commands, you will remain in my love, just as I have obeyed my Father's commands and remain in his love" (15:10). Such obedience is the expression of love (14:15, 21) and is the condition for intimacy (14:23). Thus, in our passage Jesus would be saying that the Father is able to fulfill his love for the Son because the Son does the Father's will. In this way, as the commentators have suggested, we see both the character of God's love and the effects of the Son's love, which is shown in obedience.

4.5 THE OTHER SHEEP NOT OF THIS FOLD

To understand who the “other sheep” from John 10:16 are, we must begin with the context of the verse and examine the whole passage. We know from many biblical passages that sheep are a symbol of true believers who follow Christ, their true Shepherd. His sheep hear His voice and follow Him. If He says that there are “other” sheep, then we must identify the original sheep that the “others” are different from. According to Hahn, when the evangelist puts on Jesus’ lips the words, there is a profound indication that the role of the messianic Good Shepherd is all inclusive and encompassing (54).

Beginning in chapter 9 of John, we find Jesus discussing at great length with the Pharisees after He healed a man who was born blind. He compares the man’s simple faith with the unbelief of the Pharisees and condemns them for their willful spiritual blindness. He begins by denouncing the false shepherds of Israel—the blind, self-appointed leaders who drew the people away from the true knowledge and kingdom of their Messiah (John 9:39-41). For Moltmann, both chapters bring out the Christo-centric and shepherd role of the messiah. He was ready to guide even those who would not accept his role in their lives (351). Then in

chapter 10, He explains at great length the nature of true sheep, those who follow the Good Shepherd, sent and appointed by God. True sheep are those who listen to the voice of the Shepherd (v. 3) and follow Him (v. 4) and know Him (v. 14). He can only be speaking here of the true sheep of Israel because, up to that point, His ministry was confined to the sheep of Israel (Hahn 58).

In verse 16, Jesus refers to the "other sheep," and those can only be sheep that are outside of Israel, in other words, Gentiles. But the Gentiles who would follow Him are no less sheep than the true sheep of Israel. In fact, Jesus makes it clear that the Gentile sheep would also hear His voice and follow Him, and, eventually, there would be only one flock and one Shepherd. This is the mystery of the universal body of Christ, the church, which Paul in his Letter to the Ephesians (Eph. 3:6) refers to "This mystery is that through the gospel the Gentiles are heirs together with Israel, members together of one body, and sharers together in the promise in Christ Jesus." A mystery in Scripture is usually something not revealed previously, and this mystery—one universal church with both Jews and Gentiles brought together in one body in the Messiah—was so shocking to the Pharisees that they accused Jesus of being a demon-possessed lunatic (John 10:20-21).

The above premise lays a firm foundation of the ministry of Jesus, the messianic Good Shepherd. If his shepherdship has such an expansive allowance for the "other sheep" it holds true the concept of inclusive substitution as discussed in chapter Two under review of related literature. Modern Biblicists like Dodd, Hahn, Wallace etc in their various works are unanimous that the Shepherd role of Christ extends beyond those who historically met him to all those who are guided by his word just as a shepherd guides his flock. It is to carry this idea further that Oduyoye opines that leaders of state and church must carefully emulate the

life of Jesus as he lived at his time (47). This would mean embracing all as leader and providing what is needed for sustenance.

4.6 THE EXTERNAL CHALLENGES OF LEADERSHIP IN NIGERIA

As noted above in our discussion of the attributes of the Good Shepherd which could be considered as internal drivers in the personality of the leader, the challenges of leadership in this segment deal with the external conditions in which the leader finds himself that have rendered him incapable of following the ideal provided by the Good Shepherd in the text of John 10:1-18. These external challenges have adversely affected leadership in Nigeria.

4.6.1 The Military Leadership in Nigeria

The military generally consists of the Army, Navy and the Air Force. The major task of the military in any state is usually defined as the defense of the state and its citizens against external aggression or attack as well as prosecution of war against another state if the need arises. The military in many African countries had largely maintained the *status quo* and confined themselves to their primary responsibility of guarding their state against external aggression until they sadly veered into governance in the continent. The first recorded military incursion or coup in Africa took place in Egypt in 1952 when Muhammad Naguib overthrew Farouk who was in power then. In West Africa, the first recorded coup took place in Togo in 1963 when Etienne Eyadema and Emanuel Bodjolle overthrew the civilian government of Sylvanus Olympio. In Nigeria, the first military coup took place on January 15, 1966 when Major Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu led a group of other young army officers to overthrow the government of Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa in what has been referred to as an Igbo coup. Since the nation's independence in 1960 till date, we have had nine coups and attempted coups in the country, which is among the highest in the continent (Okaneme 5).

It is on record that the military has ruled Nigeria for longer period than the civilians

since the country attained independence in 1960 till date. The military had held on to power for 29 years out of the 57 years the Nigerian state has so far lasted. While some may argue in favour of the frequent military intrusions into the political terrain in Nigeria especially in trying to prevent the country from disintegration, many critically-minded citizens of the country tenaciously hold the view that the military contributed in no small measure to the present massive underdevelopment, decadence and unprecedented degradation being witnessed in the country today (8). The long and wasted years of military rule in the country surely contributed massively to the plethora of massive social, economic and political upheavals and degradation being sadly witnessed in the country today.

Many discerning Nigerians unrepentantly allude to the fact that the massive corruption being witnessed in the country today is a sad creation of the military that saw governance as an opportunity and an uncommon chance for shameful self-enrichment and cronyism. Democracy evolves with time and when democracy is allowed to evolve through the learning curve, the country stands to gain socially, economically and politically. Unfortunately for the Nigerian state, democracy has not been allowed to effectively evolve and grow until in the last eighteen to nineteen years of uninterrupted democracy. The frequent military interventions in the country, some of them hopelessly needless, have massively contributed to the stagnant nature of the nation's democracy today. Okaneme buttressed this fact lucidly that the Military were not ready to give Civilians enough time to be able to order their affairs and yet it was to be seen that no military dictator intended to promote true democracy (13).

Maduabuchi Dukor shares the above view and adds that greed and self-aggrandizement had characterized almost all military interventions in the politics of Africa and Nigeria in particular and saw their position as a short cut to power, wealth and fame (228).

Furthermore, Karo Ogbinaka tried to link the destruction of the status of citizenship in the country to the effect of military perpetuation in power. He opined that one of the effects of military rule was the animosity and apprehension between the government and the people. The administration trained the military to protect the government against attacks by the people against whose consent they were ruling. This resulted in many cases of military brutality unleashed on the people (247-248). The citizenry felt alienated by the actions of their leaders.

The question some people will be asking is: How did the military under develop Nigeria? The Nigerian military contributed massively towards the country's underdevelopment. The issue of corruption cannot be discussed in Nigeria without highlighting how the military helped to perpetuate corruption in Nigeria. According Esson, we may not forget in a hurry how military rulers like Babangida and Abacha and even Abdusalami Abubakar stole this country blind all in the name of military governance. It is almost inconceivable to recall that most retired generals in the country are multimillionaires today. How did they acquire such stupendous wealth for which they are known and identified today?

Kukah minced no words in blaming the military for the numerous socio-political ills of the country. He says:

> Notwithstanding the coups of 1966 and 1967 and the three-year civil war, the decision of the military to stay on in power was one of the worst decisions. The military had embarked on scare mongering culture of fear that deepened the hostilities among our people and led to the distrust of politics and politicians. The military itself, which has the sole monopoly of violence and had used violence to secure power, widened the gap of confidence between the people and their politicians. Politics lost its glamour and politicians were projected as thieves and criminals while the military deceived the

people by presenting themselves as heroes, redeemers and patriots (13-14).

Continuing, Kukah asserts that due to military intervention in politics and with the brutality that characterized their actions, they ended intimidating politicians, killing some and imprisoning others. Politics therefore became dreaded and was left into the hands of those who could wrestle with the sharks in the military (14).

Mohammed was emphatic in his assessment of the performance of the military in running the economy. According to him, the military legacy in the economy is the entrenchment of the country into a neo-colonial capitalist economy. The military contributed in plunging the economy into deeper crisis with a bad crises management strategy that was anchored on adjustment policies (584). Though the military eventually returned power back to civilians in the country on 29th May 1999, the colossal damage to the social, economic and political spheres of the country had been done by the military. Again, the deliberate choice of Olusegun Obasanjo as president in 1999 by the military high command, which was obvious to all discerning minds, was a fatal error. Obasanjo being a retired army general was deliberately chosen over and above Alex Ekwueme, a distinguished and credible politician and a former vice president. Obasanjo was chosen not because he was a credible and tested politician but because he came from the military constituency and the army needed one of their own to rule in order to protect their narrow and chauvinistic interest in government. The critical question is: what was Obasanjo's contribution or contributions to the development of the Nigerian state in the past that qualified him to be given a second chance to rule the country? Of course, there is no positive answer to this critical question. Of course, true to his antecedents, Obasanjo foisted on the entire nation a draconian and orchestrated autocratic rule in the name of democracy for eight years from 1999 – 2007 and to add insult to injury wanted to perpetuate himself in power through the famed third term project or agenda which was only scuttled by a group of patriotic politicians in the National Assembly (65).

4.6.2 Political-Corruption Factor

Whenever the word "corruption" is mentioned in the Nigerian state, it sadly reminds millions of Nigerian citizens of their unfortunate state of being and their uncertain and precarious future in a country that ordinarily should not have any business with poverty and perennial backwardness. It has been stated several times that corruption is a universal phenomenon and therefore not peculiar to the Nigerian state though it is very prevalent here. Corruption is a pervasion. It deters human and national growth hence nations of the world make critical and concerted efforts towards its eradication or reduction (Melaba 98).

However, in this segment of the research, the researcher is not discussing corruption generally but will narrow the discourse to an aspect of corruption known as political corruption. Gyekye gives a broad definition of political corruption. According to him:

> Political corruption, the kind of corruption that involves the rulers and other public officials who run the affairs of a state or a political community, is a perennial problem that appears to afflict the politically organized human societies- rich or poor, developed or developing, ancient, traditional or modern the running of whose affairs is entrusted to a group of people called public officials. But for several reasons, the phenomenon of political corruption manifests itself more often in some societies than in others, is more widespread or pervasive in some societies than in others and produces more devastating effects on some societies than on others (394).

Gyekye goes ahead to define political corruption as the illegal, unethical and unauthorized exploitation of one's political or official position for personal gain or advantage (395).

That political corruption is the bane of the Nigerian state is not in doubt. There is an overwhelming consensus among critically minded Nigerians that political corruption has dealt and has continued to deal a cruel blow to the nation's quest for social, economic and

political development. However, it can be arguably stated that political corruption has been on the rise since the return of democratic rule in 1999.

Political corruption has greatly slowed down social development, reduced economic development and has almost made nonsense of our quest for political progress over the years leaving the country and millions of her citizens highly pauperized and traumatized. Many Nigerian politicians venture into politics solely for the purpose of self-enrichment or else how does one explain the massive looting that has systematically been going on in the country since the return to democratic rule in 1999 till date? It will be belabouring the obvious to state that the country's democracy has deliberately produced millionaires among the political class while leaving millions of Nigerian citizens poor and impoverished. Democracy which is supposed to bring about development for the nation and improved living conditions for the generality of the citizens has unfortunately brought retardation, retrogression, poverty, penury and under development. It is indeed a national disgrace and inglorious calamity (Okaneme 34).

Despite all this show of shame and the gradual reduction in the life worth of Nigerians, the government tells the impoverished and poverty-stricken citizens almost on daily basis that it is fighting corruption. What a contradiction! It is the belief of many critically minded Nigerians that this present government has deliberately impoverished millions of Nigerians through very poor, uncoordinated and hazardous economic policies (36). While millions of Nigerians groan on a daily basis as a result of unbridled poverty occasioned by the nosedive of the nation's economy due to poor economic policies of the administrations under consideration, all they get in reaction from the administrations is the assurances from the government that things will improve.

Now the question is: what critical economic measures have these administrations put in place to ensure that the economy of the country turns around for good so that millions of

Nigerians who are literarily starving on daily basis can have a new lease of life? For sure, the economy of nations does not thrive and grow based on goodwill and promises that are devoid of any critical rationality. It is sad to recall that the nation has a large retinue of qualified and proven economic technocrats who can be assembled to churn out credible economic policies to save the nation's economy from its current state of comatose so that Nigerians can heave a sigh of relief and live a new life. Why this has not been done up till now beats the imagination of many Nigerians (Adibe 311).

4.6.3 Economic-Corruption Factor

One of the greatest undoing of some Nigerian leaders is the economic-corruption factor. This form of corruption characterizes leadership at all levels. It was in the bid to put this trend at bay that some Commissions were established. For example, the Code of Conduct Bureau (CCB) is the pioneer anti-corruption agency set up by the Federal Government of Nigeria. It has the primary responsibility of checking corrupt practices in the Nigerian public service and has been doing so since 1989.

Then came the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC). It is an agency of government that was inaugurated on 29 September 2000 following the recommendation of the then President Olusegun Obasanjo. The mandate was to receive and investigate reports of corruption and in appropriate cases prosecute the offender(s), to examine, review and enforce the correction of corruption prone systems and procedures of public bodies, with a view to eliminating corruption in public, and to educate and enlighten the public on and against corruption and related offences with a view to enlisting and fostering public support for the fight against corruption (Moyosore 10).

In 2003, the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) was established as a law enforcement agency to investigate financial crimes such as advance fee fraud (419

fraud) and money laundering. While the ICPC targets corruption in the public sector, especially bribery, gratification, graft and abuse or misuse of office, the EFCC investigates people in all sectors who appear to be living above their means and other financial crimes (16).

Without gain saying, it is a wide held belief that corruption is a way of life in Nigeria and that it is responsible for the most part, for broken promises and dashed hopes which has characterized the lives of most Nigerians. It is not surprising to hear people saying that Nigerians are corrupt making it *a fait accompli*. More so, Nigeria is a country where corruption is rife and where greed for material acquisition and quest for political power has relegated morality preached by various religions to the background. This is because even our claim to be religious does not impact on public life. The end, it is believed, justifies the means. To this end, there is now growing realization about the ill effects of corruption on the nation's social, political and economic fabrics **(**15).

Though it is evident that there is no country that is totally impervious to corruption, the incidences of corruption are on the increase especially in poor and developing states. The Anti-corruption efforts seem not to holistically address the issue, hence, large scale corruption related cases, accusations and counter-accusations. There were cases of missing funds, police pensions scam, missing oil revenue or non-remittance into the federation account, contract scam, oil theft, administrative inefficiency or dereliction of duty, illegal sale or allotment of government land and property, bribery, extortion and other forms of corruption, economic and financial crimes (New Telegraph 6). These have distorted the face of leadership in Nigeria.

4.6.4 Poor Leadership Recruitment Process

Leadership recruitment process can simply be defined as the process through which political leaders emerge in the polity. A flawed leadership recruitment process will surely lead to the emergence of political leaders who are ill equipped for leadership and governance. Kukah is of the view that one of the initial wrong steps is that too many people from all cadres of leadership coming into public life have no preparation and no pedigree or evidence of exposure and success in any other form of endeavour beyond the patronage of politics (214). This is evident in the kind of politics that they play.

To bring the point home, it is a political tragedy to know that many elected political office holders both past and present have never held any public office in their lives prior to their election. The question then is: where do they get the requisite knowledge for leadership since experience is said to be the best teacher. Such neophytes are left entirely at the mercy of career civil servants who readily cash in on their inexperience to massively manipulate the system to their utmost advantage and to the great disadvantage of the nation. It is to the advantage of politicians who wish to contest elections that they start from the lower rung of the ladder, learn the ropes and eventually climb to the top. This will surely make room for effective and effectual political leadership at various levels of the political process instead of what is presently obtainable in the polity, which is almost chaotic to say the least (216). This too has constituted a huge impediment to the quality of leaders we have in Nigeria.

In other words, the problem with our leadership recruitment process – and I use the term "leadership" liberally to encompass any elective or appointive position, from the bottom up, which includes candidates for all appointive and elective positions, as well as the leadership of the various legislative houses after elections – is fast assuming the status of the conventional problem with the weather: everyone knows and talks about it, but nobody seems to be able to do anything to change it. However, much unlike the weather systems, where

there is little or nothing any one of us can do as humans to change the course of nature, the problem of our leadership selection process is well within our powers and wherewithal to work and improve upon, but we somehow always fail to do those vital little things that are required to make a marked difference.

Seuss opines that the process of leadership selection in our own peculiar environment is a totally different ball game altogether in the sense that those who have somehow appropriated and cornered for themselves the rights to pick out or select from amongst the long list of aspiring politicians on our behalf appear to be either reluctant or strangely uncomfortable with pushing forward and implementing the kinds of reforms that will ensure only individuals who meet the relevant criteria of qualification, knowledge, experience, vision, skills, wisdom and courage, amongst others, are put forward for such positions (43). This is, perhaps, because such people may not be amenable to being teleguided or pushed around in a manner that their benefactors have come to expect over the years.

As a result, they often prefer the largely docile type, regardless of whether they possess or lack these vital criteria or skills set, or, indeed, even the necessary educational qualification to deliver on the job. In fact, more often than not, such 'favoured breed' usually ends up having to use fake or cooked-up certificates – sometimes with the foreknowledge or even at the prodding of their benefactor(s) – in order to meet the prescribed minimum qualification for the envisaged office or position (47).

According to Venar all this, happening in a country that is substantially blessed with highly educated and experienced pool of qualified personnel in virtually all spheres or disciplines of human endeavor is incongruous. Consequently, the envisaged realistic elimination of the "garbage – in, garbage – out" syndrome will take quite some doing, and

one personally sees it remaining with us longer than we may seem to desire. Unless, of course, this set of self-appointed 'kingmakers', also known locally as "godfathers", who perennially go about oozing their familiar overbearing attitude on the rest of the population either change their ways, or we somehow collectively find a way to dislodge them from their current vise-like grip on our political leadership selection process (152).

Ruminating on this, Seuss further asserts:

> Of course, one very much understands and appreciates the concept of expecting the voters to choose the best among the candidates on offer across party lines. But the main challenge here is that majority of our largely uneducated pool of electorate, on their part, do not still understand or appreciate the fact that they can, indeed, vote for the candidate of a different party other than the main party they support, depending on the quality of the candidate presented by each party (49).

In other words, the concept they seem to generally accept and entirely go by, more often than not, is one which tends to imply that once they massively support a particular political party or candidate in a state or an area, it then automatically follows that they just have to vote and return any and all candidates presented by that party across all the conceivable election types conducted by Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) – i.e. Presidential, Governorship, Senatorial, House of Representatives and State Houses of Assembly elections – and possibly, even local government council elections conducted by the various State Independent Electoral Commissions (SIECs), regardless of whether or not other more qualified or better suited candidates may be running for the same position on another party platform (52).

The resulting dangerous phenomenon, which is largely fueled by such mindset, has appropriately been dubbed and has since come to be known and regarded as the "bandwagon effect" in local electoral parlance. Again, since this kingmaker or godfather syndrome appears to have permeated virtually all or most of the major political parties that stand any chance of winning a seat in any election, what this means is that even where the voters are sufficiently informed about the preferred or desirable type(s) of candidate(s) to vote in an election, they may sometimes actually end up being left with not much of a choice for a particular position (not all, perhaps, admittedly), if the godfathers in all the major parties decide to field less than desirable candidates. In that case, therefore, it simply becomes the small matter of choosing between the lesser of two or, perhaps, more 'evils', if you excuse the use of the term (Venar 153).

It is the full realization of this fact, coupled with the vise-like grip of such godfathers on existing party structures that informed INEC's decision to include amongst the list of amendments to the legal framework it submitted to the National Assembly as far back as late 2012 or thereabouts, the need for the introduction of Independent Candidacy in our electoral laws. The idea behind that was for the purpose allowing (an) independent candidate(s) – i.e. any eligible person(s) who happen(s) to meet a very strict set of specified qualification criteria for such – to be able to circumvent the influence of godfatherism in deciding who gets to be on the ballot as a party candidate. Perhaps, not totally unexpectedly, that amendment did not sail through in the end (Josani 221).

Seuss recalls one presentation at an international elections forum where the representative from the Electoral Commission of India informed the audience about a new radical inclusion on their ballot – the first and only country in the world to have done that, so far – during their last general elections known by its acronym, 'NOTA', which stands for

"None of the Above". He explains, this unique voting option, which was introduced following persistent pressure from the voting public who consistently complained that they often do not like any of the candidates vying for certain positions in an election, allowed such voters to still go out and cast their vote (a right they consider as their sacred constitutional duty), by rejecting all the candidates on offer, rather than the more traditional way of signifying such rejection by staying at home and abstaining from voting completely on election day (Seuss 41).

During its first year of introduction on a test basis, over 6 million people opted to vote 'NOTA' in place of any of the party candidates, which sent a very clear message as a way of registering their utmost discontent with all the competing political parties in the elections over what they considered as their wrong choice of candidates (46).

For instance, Akangba argues that while many relatively smaller countries within the African continent still marvel at Nigeria's huge registered voting population figure of just over 70 million (i.e. those with valid Permanent Voters Cards) during the last general elections in 2015, the Election Commission of India put the number of people who were eligible to vote in their 2014 general elections at a whopping 814.5 million, representing an increase of a whopping 100 million people in a space of just 5 years over and above those registered for the 2009 elections! It would, of course, be nice to see how that figure compares with what may be obtainable in the world's most populous country, except that China, with a population of 1.4 billion compared to India's 1.3 billion people, is not a democracy, so we may never have a basis for such a comparison any time soon and, perhaps, never will (Akangba 97).

And, yes, the legally permissible recall of elected officials in Nigeria is a rather tedious process, which probably explains why none has succeeded thus far in our recent history. I am not exactly sure what may have obtained during the First Republic, but as much as I can tell, nothing of that nature has happened ever since. Of course, there is this ideal notion that the voters should be free to choose the preferred candidates of their choice, regardless of party affiliation, and there are, perhaps, a number of instances one can possibly cite where that has, indeed, been the case. But, having said that, what about a probable situation where all the possible alternatives as presented by the different parties end up not being from among the "experienced bests"? (Venar 33).

One might say that appears rather far-fetched or highly improbable, but it is not completely beyond the realm of possibilities, as far as some of these godfathers – who actually exist in most of the major political parties, by the way, although, admittedly, more prevalent in some than in others – are concerned. The most conceivable solution, therefore, still lies in the ultimate release of the party structures from the vise-like grip of godfathers and other money bags, to make way for a more open and democratic system of selecting candidates, because even the Independent Candidacy route is not entirely accessible to everyone, in the sense that one still has to have the wherewithal – mostly financial – to campaign and sell oneself outside of the formal party structure, even if the requirement for such has been met. As Abraham Bell rightly argues, "it is a moral and sociological absurdity if the best men are not elected" (Seuss 76).

4.6.5 The Challenge of Ethnicity

Ethnicity can simply be defined as consciousness of or emphasis on ethnic identity or culture. Ethnicity has been a major factor in universal politics and political

engagement. While some nations have been able to manage it critically for their overall political development, others sadly have not been fortunate in managing the diversity that comes along with ethnicity. Nigeria as a country has been among the countries that have not been able to manage its ethnic challenges effectively and efficiently. Major political decisions are usually taken based on ethnic leanings. Nwaorgu holds this view when he believes that what is today called Nigeria is a creation of the British colonial policy that did not take into cognizance the sensibility of the people as whether or not they wanted to live together as one people. The different ethnic and linguistic groups were constituted into one without their consultation. There has always been a general sense of suspicion sometimes by the majority group against the minority and at other times the other way round. This tendency is seen in leaders and those they lead. Any true follower of the Nigerian political history can hardly argue against this tendency (311).

Arguing on ethnic pluralism and its negative impact on the political landscape of Nigeria, Dukor opines that this factor cannot be easily wished away. The process of nation building in African states has been an uphill task because of the diversity of ethnicities in the respective states. From historical perspective, ethnic pluralism has contributed more in negative terms to nation building than its positive growth. The ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversities among the people of African states created diversities of interests, opinions and political leanings as well as endemic and epidemic rivalries. Nigeria makes interesting and exciting example of a nation-state with multiethnic, multi-linguistic and multicultural groupings. Apart from the major ethnic nationalities like Hausa, Yoruba, Ibo and Tiv, there are over one hundred other ethnic groups in Nigeria. (187).

Ethnicity has done and has continued to do a colossal damage to the Nigerian state both in social, economic and political spheres. A situation where merit and meritocracy is thrown overboard in favour of one's place of birth and the language one speaks remain a sore

point in any nation's quest for even development. The issue of ethnicity and religious bigotry has been exalted beyond compare especially in the present political and democratic dispensation in Nigeria. Appointment into major positions in the country has been shamelessly and brazenly skewed to favour a particular geographical and ethnic region to the utter consternation of other zones thus even reducing to nothingness the so-called federal character principle that is even enshrined in the country's constitution. Perhaps, the presidency now becomes an uncommon opportunity for people whom the president hails from their ethnic nationality to corner all the juicy appointments and opportunities in the country as a matter of false inheritance (186).

CHAPTER FIVE

THE GOOD SHEPHERD MODEL AND CONTEMPORARY LEADERSHIP IN NIGERIA FROM 1999-2015

In this section of the work, a résumé of the failure of the shepherds of Israel and how they stood condemned in Ezekiel 34 and how the Pharisees in Jesus' time toed the line of their forebears and acted treacherously towards the sheep. It was the attitude of both of them that made Jesus in the Discourse in John 10:8 to refer to them as "All those who came before me are thieves and robbers….". The Pharisees who were considered as shepherds of God's people behaved like thieves and robbers. Jesus appeared as filling the gap and the inadequacies of the Pharisees and presented Himself as the model of leadership with the content, character and competence that were lacking in the shepherds of Israel and particularly in the Pharisees and Scribes.

5.1 DENUNCIATION OF THE SHEPHERDS OF ISRAEL

Israel's leaders were indicted for their failure to care for the nation. Ezekiel 34 used the metaphor of shepherding to illustrate how Israel's leaders (shepherds) oppressed the people (flock) within God's kingdom. The shepherds looked only to their own interests by clothing and feeding themselves at the expense of the needs of the flock (Ezek. 34:2, 3, 8). According to Dillard, instead of strengthening and healing the sheep in their time of need, or

searching for them when lost, the shepherds had fiercely dominated them (Ezek. 34:4). This left the sheep vulnerable to wild beasts (hostile nations) and scattered them throughout the world (Ezek. 34:5-6, 8) (311). Thus God promised to save the sheep from the "mouths" of the shepherds (Israel's rulers), search and care for his sheep, and bring them back from where they were scattered (Ezek. 34:9-12). He will lead them back to their own land, feed them, and have them lie down in safety in good grazing ground (Ezek. 34:13-14). Ultimately, God will judge between the fat sheep (beneficiaries and participants in the oppression) and the lean sheep (the weak and oppressed, Ezek. 34:15-22) (315). This deliverance climaxes with the future appointment of the ultimate shepherd, a second David, who will feed and care for God's flock as a prince should under God's kingship (Ezek. 34:23-24).This will mark a time when God will make a covenant of peace with his sheep/people that will ensure God's blessings of protection, fruitfulness and freedom in the land (Ezek. 34:25-31). By this all will know that God is with his people and is their true God (Ezek. 34:30-31). Ezekiel 34 denounces the "shepherds of Israel" because of their failure in leading God's people. The shepherds were the tyrannical civil rulers over the nation of Judah who were more interested in "feathering their own nest" than in caring for God's people (Dempster 94). The shepherds of Israel failed to do what God commanded shepherds to do and then compounded their sin by using their position over the nation to their own financial advantage.

What did the shepherds do wrong here? According to Coogan, first, they failed to feed the sheep and fed themselves instead. They acted as if they own the sheep, able to treat them as they wanted, rather than as God had instructed them to treat the sheep—like owners, not stewards. Second, they did not bind up the broken or heal the diseased. Third, they did not gather or bring back the sheep that had been scattered. According to verse 5, this scattering happened because there was no shepherd. Fourth, they ruled the sheep harshly (v.4 “with force and with severity you have dominated them”). Fifth, because they were scattered,

the sheep were exposed to the danger of wild animals who would devour them (430). In verse 6, we are given an extended description of this scattering: "My flock wandered through all the mountains and on every high hill; My flock was scattered over all the surface of the earth, and there was no one to search or seek for them." God laments the situation in which his sheep were scattered and wandered off alone. How did God then react to such negligence? He said that he was against those shepherds, and he demanded his sheep from them. He called those shepherds to account. He set himself in opposition to them. He was not going to allow his sheep to endure that kind of treatment from negligent and domineering under-shepherds (433).

According to Stuhlmueller, most other references in the Old Testament to shepherds of God's people are denouncing the failure of these leaders to act as good shepherds. As noted above, Ezekiel rails against the shepherds of Israel who had been pasturing themselves instead of the sheep (Ezek 34:2). He lists their shortcomings: "You did not strengthen the weak nor heal the sick nor bind up the injured. You did not bring back the strayed nor seek the lost, but you lorded it over them harshly and brutally (906). So they were scattered for lack of a shepherd, and became food for all the wild beasts" (Ezek 34:4-5). And so, God vows to come against these shepherds and claim the sheep from them, saying, "I myself will look after and tend my sheep" (Ezek 34:11). God will "rescue them from every place where they were scattered" (v. 12), will "lead them out from among the peoples and gather them from the foreign lands," will "bring them back to their own country" (v. 13) and pasture them in good pastures (v. 14). Second Isaiah elaborates the same theme: "Like a shepherd he feeds the flock, in his arms he gathers the lambs, carrying them in his bosom, and leading the ewes with care" (Isa 40:11).

A motif emerges of a divine promise to raise up new shepherds. Jeremiah prophesies that God will gather the remnant of the flock and "will appoint shepherds for them who will shepherd them so that they need no longer fear and tremble, and none shall be missing" (Jer 23:3-4) (907).

The shepherding metaphor sends a message promising judgment on Israel's wicked rulers and hope for the downtrodden and disadvantaged of the nation. This message of leadership, drawn from shepherding, is applicable to other calling and in this work the political leadership call. Good leaders seek the interest of others before "feeding" themselves. Leadership that imitates "the Good Shepherd" of John 10:1-18 is fundamentally an office that requires genuine care for the wellbeing of people. This crop of selfish leaders/shepherds were present even in Jesus' time as Scribes and Pharisees. Jesus denounced them as thieves and robbers in the manner Ezekiel denounced the shepherds of Israel.

5.2 THE PHARISEES AS 'THIEVES AND ROBBERS'

According to Hackett, Jesus equated the religious leaders of Israel as bad shepherds, who did not truly care for the sheep. He equated them, in fact, with thieves and robber (232). *"*All who came before me are thieves and robbers, but the sheep did not listen to them*"* (John 10:8). So, who were these religious leaders? We have three groups that were prominently discussed in the New Testament – the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Scribes. The Old Testament itself does not mention the Pharisees. From a first century CE Jewish historian named Josephus it is known that the Pharisees constituted one of the several important Jewish groups who wielded considerable influence in the Judaism of that time. Josephus, who wrote in Greek to explain Jewish traditions and history to non-Jewish audience, labels the Pharisees a "philosophy," emphasizing their religious character, but they were also a potent political force in their early history. They struggled to preserve the Jewish traditions, which they

believed were being eroded by external political influences and internal lax observance of the Law (Torah) among Jews. The Pharisees were mostly a lay movement within Judaism, they opposed the priestly aristocracy in Jerusalem as well as the increasing Hellenization of their society (Stuhmueller 732). The Pharisees were the Jewish rabbinical sect viewed as the ruling religious party of Palestine in Jesus' day. The Pharisees came onto the scene after the Maccabean revolt against Seleucid and Greek rule in 167 BC. The Zealots continued the battle against the Greek influences, oftentimes using violence (Heiser 202). The Pharisees appeared to have formed as an alternative to the Zealots around 100 BC, recognizing that the opposition of the Greeks (and the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persian before them) as God's punishment for failing to keep the Law. The name Pharisee means 'separated' referring to their attempt to maintain the purity of Jewish traditions by avoiding contact with impure cultural influences and they were determined to live separated from the pagans by pursuing strict devotion and adherence to the Mosaic law found in the Torah (first five books of the Old Testament). This explains their opposition to Jesus. How could he be the Messiah when he failed to keep the Law as they did? Jesus pushed back against their legalism and their failure to truly understand the heart and purpose of the Father. The Pharisees, focused on interpreting the Old Testament and teaching exegetically, saw the synagogues as their domain (204).

Christians have become familiar with the Pharisees mostly through the New Testament, especially the Gospels. Outside of the Gospels the Pharisees are mentioned only in Paul and Acts. Paul proudly refers to himself as a Pharisee "in observance of the law" (Phil 3:5) in the context of an autobiographical passage defending his impeccable Jewish heritage. This positive context is reinforced by his recollection of the zealous desire to preserve the traditions of his ancestors (Gal 1:14). Acts paints a somewhat ambivalent portrait of Pharisees (Stuhmueller 732).

This relatively neutral or positive portrayal of the Pharisees is overshadowed by the sharply negative images in the Gospels. All four Gospels show the Pharisees as archenemies of Jesus and his disciples, allied to others, such as Scribes Sadducees and Chief priests. If at times the New Testament acknowledges a distinction between these Jewish groups, the norm is more often a historically inaccurate presentation of the Pharisees as conspirators with other Jewish groups in continual opposition to Jesus. Matthew, for example, curiously combines Pharisees with Sadducees (3:7; 16:1) as if they were friendly allies, when in fact they were bitter enemies (733). Pharisees were portrayed pejoratively as legalistic (Lk 6:1-5), petty (Matt 23:23-24), and arrogant (Lk 18:11-12). The very word Pharisee became synonymous with "hypocrite," and one who said one thing but did the opposite. The most vehement portrait of all is that of Matthew 23:3-36, where the Pharisees were excoriated, along with the scribes, in a series of condemnations. They were hypocritical blind guides, a self-indulgent "brood of vipers," who had their priorities entirely mixed up, who lay upon others burdens they themselves could not bear, and who "were like whitewashed tombs, which appeared beautiful on the outside, but inside were full of dead men's bones and every filth" (v.27). This fiery portrait was compounded by numerous scenes of confrontation in which the Pharisees either accused Jesus and his disciples of breaking the Jewish traditions (Mk 7:5; Jn 9:16), try to entrap Jesus on legal technicalities (Mk 10:2; 12:13; Matt 22:34-35), or improperly sought signs (Mk 8:11). Although Pharisees were said to participate in the plot against Jesus (Matt 12:14; Jn 7:32; 11:57; 18:3), they did not figure prominently in the Gospel passion narratives.

The Scribes, traditionally charged with copying the Scriptures, in Jesus' day were the legal experts on the issues of the Law. The scribes, many of whom were Pharisees, were the authoritative teachers (rabbis) in the temple. As "lawyers" they confronted those who broke the Law. Originally, scribes were secular functionaries that came to prominence as religious

leaders in postexilic times. As skilled writers and interpreters of the biblical texts, they became invaluable when the focus of religious life shifted to the law. In the New Testament, scribes continue to be influential. The majority of New Testament references to scribes are pejorative, painting them in contrast to Jesus and his teaching. The New Testament rarely mentions a scribe individually but most often referred to scribes collectively, usually in association with other groups like the Pharisees, Sadducees or chief priests. In the first century CE the scribes were well-educated professionals whose ability to read and write placed them in the powerful position of transmitting and interpreting the oral and written traditions of Judaism. They were the legal scholars and theologians of their day (881).

The overwhelming portrait of the scribes in the New Testament was, however, not positive. Rather, the scribes were seen as part of the mass of opposition to Jesus and the disciples, which culminated in his passion and death. In the Synoptic Gospels especially, the scribes were most frequently seen in polemical contexts concerning teaching authority, or participating in the plot to entrap Jesus. Mark 1:22 explicitly commends Jesus' teaching, "for he taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes." This attitude would have been very offensive to those professionally trained in the interpretation of God's law. Yet the contrast between the authoritative teaching of Jesus, seen in words and in miraculous deeds, and the traditional interpretation of the Law of Israel is an essential part of the gospel message that God has acted uniquely in Jesus Christ (883).

By the time of John's Gospel, the scribes apparently did not warrant specific mention, for they did not appear in this Gospel as prominently as in the Synoptics. Instead, the generic term "the Jews" was most frequently used to describe the opposition to Jesus. It is with these convictions that the scribes and Pharisees confronted Jesus (Carson 321).

Wright holds that Jesus did not have issues with the Pharisees because they were Pharisees. Rather, Jesus confronted the Pharisees as a collective group with their hypocrisy and legalistic religiosity (Matthew 23:2-4; Luke 11:46) (116). They clamored for the limelight of honour and the approval of others (Matthew 23:5-7; Mark 12:38**;** Luke 11:43). Most condemningly, the Scribes and Pharisees were more concerned with appearances than reality, more concerned with law than caring for people. They were more concerned with sentencing the woman caught in adultery (John 8:3-11) than restoring her to God. Jesus stated that these bad shepherds came "only to steal and kill and destroy" (John 10:10) (119).

They were likened to shepherds who committed transgressions against the Lord. During the first century, the failures of the shepherds of the Jews continued. Chapter 9 of John's Gospel contains a particularly egregious example of the failure of the shepherds of God's people. The man born blind was excommunicated from the synagogue for his testimony of Christ after Jesus opened his eyes at Siloam (Jn 9:1-34). If anyone should have recognized Jesus, it was the Pharisees, who were experts in God's law and served as shepherds of the people. However, not only did they deny Christ, but they also sought to silence others who did affirm Him (Kasemann 241). These false shepherds insisted on trusting in themselves and did not display the attitude of worshipful submission that characterized the man born blind (v. 40). Their failure forms the backdrop of the Good Shepherd Discourse in John 10:1-18. In light of the failures of the crooked shepherds, Jesus came as the only true and faithful shepherd of God's people (245).

The researcher mentioned earlier in this work how a shepherd would lay down in the doorway to keep the sheep in and the predatory animals out, work tirelessly to lead them to fresh pastures and fresh water, search out sheep when they stray, comfort sheep when they

are hurt, keep sheep from fighting and from hurting each other etc. Here Jesus alluded to the Old Testament prophecies of God protecting His people and providing good pasture for them. Jesus was clearly talking about a spiritual idea in that He offered salvation to all who enter through Him in verse 9 and that is the means to becoming one of His sheep for whom He will care (Wright 243). Jesus contrasted Himself with the evil shepherds who, like those in the Old Testament, were in reality thieves and robbers. This was Jesus' charge against the Pharisees. They were the 'thieves and robbers.' Notice in verse 8 that the "all who came before Me" **are**, not **were,** thieves and robbers. Jesus was dealing with both past and present reality (Kasemann 312). In addition, Jesus made this charge against the Pharisees and other religious leaders of that day.

In Matthew 23 Jesus pronounced a series of "woes" upon the scribes and Pharisees including the following: they would travel extensively to make a proselyte and when they succeeded they would make him "twice as much a son of hell" as themselves (vs. 15) (Funk 78). They were trying to steal God's sheep. They were careful to keep minute points of the Mosaic law but "neglected the weightier provision of the law: justice and mercy and faithfulness" (vs 23). Mark 12:40 adds they sought to devour widow's houses. They sought to destroy. In verses 29-35 Jesus pronounced a woe upon them for the prophets, wise men and scribes they would murder. Jesus had recently accused them of seeking to murder Him. They sought to kill. By contrast, Jesus sought to provide, build and give life. He protected the sheep as the door. He provided pasture for them, and He came that they might have life, and might have it abundantly (80).

Jesus is the door of the sheep. The Pharisees were thieves and robbers. They steal, but Jesus provides. They destroy, but Jesus builds. They kill, but Jesus gives abundant life. Jesus is the only door to that abundant life. He is the way, the truth and the life, and no one comes

to the Father except through Him (John 14:6). Anyone among the sheep that entered by another means is false and will be separated from the sheep and cast out in judgment (Matthew 13:36-43; 47-50). Jesus is the good shepherd. The word "good" was used here with the sense of excellence and it contrasted Him with the hirelings who were evil shepherds. The true shepherd loved and cared for his sheep. The hireling loved and cared for himself. When danger approached, the true shepherd will defend while the hireling will run away (85).

What is true here about Jesus as a shepherd should also be true of His under-shepherds. Leaders are called to care for, feed and defend the flock/people that God has entrusted to them. The tragedy is that many people who are called leaders are no different from these evil hirelings of so long ago. They seek their own comfort and fleece the flock instead of feeding the flock. They protect themselves and run away from trouble instead of defending and warning the flock of danger (Hackett 211).

Leadership is a structured pattern of life and all forms of leadership need to have the interest of the people at the centre of operation. Sometimes the people that are led do not always know how to get around the challenges of life that assail them. It is left for the leader to provide the needed guide. In this section of the work, Jesus is presented as the model of leadership with the required content, character and competence of a leader vis-à-vis Nigerian leaders particularly from 1999-2015 who were seen to have fallen far too short of the ideal provided by Jesus, the Good Shepherd. This model of leadership exemplified in the life and ministry of Jesus far stands out in comparative terms with the false shepherds in Ezekiel's time and the Scribes and Pharisees in Jesus' time.

5.3 THE GOOD SHEPHERD AS A MODEL OF LEADERSHIP

Gunter asserts that the shepherd-leader motif in Scripture has garnered increasing attention among scholars concerned with the nature and function of pastoral leadership in recent years. Academic writers have developed exegetical analyses of the shepherding metaphor in biblical theology and surveyed the understanding and practice of shepherd leadership throughout church history (Gunter 206). This section of the research delves into the biblical depiction of the shepherd leader, giving particular attention to the 'Good Shepherd' Discourse in John 10 and how this has become a model for leadership.

The shepherd metaphor is an appropriate and useful image for depicting the nature, role, and proper functions of faithful leadership among God's people and in the world of politics. Here two realities emerge. First, the prominence of the shepherding metaphor in both the Old and New Testaments suggests continuity in the roles and expectations of godly leaders across the epochs of redemptive history. Second, a careful examination of John 10:1-18 commonly known as the 'Good Shepherd Discourse', indicates that Jesus' description of the Good Shepherd is rightly understood as a model for future pastoral and leaders in all realms to emulate.

The ancient near Eastern shepherd is one of the most frequently invoked images of ideal leadership for God's people found in the Bible. Laniak explains that the shepherd metaphor proves especially useful for depicting godly leadership due to the obvious parallels between the multi-faceted roles and responsibilities of the well-known common shepherd and the spiritual and political leaders of Israel and the church:

> Shepherd is a felicitous metaphor for human leadership because both occupations have a comparable variety of diverse tasks that are constantly negotiated... Shepherds had to combine broad competencies in animal husbandry with capacities for scouting,

> defense, and negotiation. The use of the shepherd metaphor for leaders affirms the coherence and inner logic of these diverse tasks and competencies (Laniak 40).

Second, the Old Testament refers to Israel's leaders as shepherds. It is worth noting here that Scripture applies shepherd leadership language to both civil and religious leaders in Israel, indicating that God extends the expectations of faithfulness to all spheres of leadership (42).

John's Gospel features the most explicit usage of shepherd language in the New Testament. John declares that his gospel is intentionally arranged in such a way as to assist the reader in coming to believe in Jesus (John 20:30- 31). This insight encourages careful exploration into each passage to better understand exactly how the author portrays Jesus and how this affects his followers. The Good Shepherd discourse (John 10:1-18) is 'an extended and complex parable' in which Jesus draws heavily on Old Testament shepherd-leader language to identify himself as the promised shepherd for whom Israel had been waiting, as well as to sharply contrast himself with the foolish shepherds in Israel in his day (Tidball 80).

When the Pharisees provoked Jesus by casting out of the synagogue a man who would not deny him, Jesus rebuked these leaders with the parable of the Good Shepherd (Keener 797). Jesus immediately draws a sharp contrast between himself and the Pharisees, identifying himself as the door by whom sheep go in and out safely while he labels the Pharisees 'thieves and robbers' (10:1-9). With these designations, Jesus draws upon the condemnations of Israel's careless shepherds pronounced by the prophets Ezekiel and Jeremiah (Bruce 223). The prophets' primary criticism of the shepherds in their days was that Israel's leaders did not care for their people. In contrast, Jesus presents himself as the good shepherd 'who lays down his life for the sheep' (10:11), emphasizing his care for his people. Tidball argues that the central emphasis of this passage is the distinct quality of affection for people found in Jesus which is lacking in Israel's previous leaders:

> The burden of John 10, however, is not so much on the task of the shepherd as on the manner in which the shepherd undertakes his role. Unlike the 'false shepherds', the good shepherd has a close and caring relationship with his flock... The climax of the metaphor takes this exercise of courage to the ultimate degree. The shepherd does not put the interests of the sheep first only when it is reasonable to do so, but also when it requires more than might be expected (Tidball 81-82).

Bruce affirms this assertion, stating, 'The 'Good' Shepherd shows himself to be a good shepherd because the welfare of the sheep, not his own, is his primary care' (Bruce 226). The care that Jesus proclaimed was the perfect revelation and fulfillment of the shepherd pronouncements made by the Lord to Israel throughout the Old Testament (Beasley-Murray 168).

As a Good Shepherd, Jesus sometimes acted as revolutionary but all in the interest of the weak and vulnerable people that he needed to protect. For example, Toryough citing Buttick asserts that even the angry disposition of Jesus that led to his flogging and chasing people out of the Temple as recorded in John 2:13-25 was to show how caring he was as a shepherd. "Making a whip of cords, he drove them all out of the Temple Court, together with the oxen and the sheep. He knocked over the tables of the money changers, scattering the coins, and ordered the people selling doves, 'Take all this away and stop turning my Father's house into a marketplace!'' Jesus' action was mainly for two reasons. First, it was against extortion and graft and second, it was against the selfish nationalism of the Jews who controlled the Temple which they believed was exclusively for them (Toryough 342). It was such attitude that Jesus would refer to those who engaged in it as 'thieves and robbers'.

Jesus' self-identification as the good shepherd promised by the Old Testament prophets is a crucial Christological development in John's gospel, but a pressing question

demands attention if the standard of this passage is to be applied to pastors. Namely, is the 'Good Shepherd' merely a messianic designation, or is Jesus prescribing a model for future godly leaders to emulate? Several scholars have argued that the shepherd language in John 10 should be rightly understood as prototypical for future shepherds in the church and for other contemporary scholars like Jean-Peare and Kasper, it includes even in the provision of secular leadership. Much of this argument centers on John's use of the Greek word *kaloj* (good) as the adjective before shepherd. Laniak explains:

> *Kaloj* implies an attractive quality, something noble or ideal. 'Model' captures these connotations, but also implies a second nuance that is important in this context: Jesus should be emulated. John makes it clear elsewhere that Jesus is ultimately training his followers to be like him in his life and death (4:34-38; 14:12; 17:20; 20:21-23; 21:15-19). They will eventually take care of his flock and risk their lives like their master (21:15-23) (Laniak 211).

Carson and Michaels concur that the vocabulary John's gospel employs denotes the good shepherd as 'true', 'real', 'genuine', 'noble', or 'ideal', and presents Jesus as 'the very model or prototype of what a shepherd should be' (Carson386; Michaels 585). Additionally, Keener has argued that had John intended to define the good shepherd as absolutely moral or righteous in character, the Greek adjective *agaqoj* would have been a more common and appropriate descriptor (Keener 813).

Expanding on Hamilton's 'suffering righteous shepherd' theme adds another important dimension to describing the unique goodness of Jesus as shepherd in John 10. The emphasis here is not that the shepherd is called 'good' solely because he suffers and dies, but

that his goodness is demonstrated by his willing endurance of suffering for the salvation of his sheep. That is, the suffering righteous shepherd suffers for a purpose, for the good of the sheep in his care. Carson explains, 'Moreover, Jesus' death is here presented as a sacrifice peculiarly directed to the redemption *of his sheep*, whether of this (Jewish) sheep pen or of others (v. 16). This emphasis on the intentionality of Jesus' sacrifice is itself grounded on Jesus' peculiar intimacy with his sheep' (Carson 386-387).

Other scholars have taken different approaches to explaining the 'good' in the Good Shepherd imagery. For example, Neyrey connects John's use of 'kalos' (which he prefers to translate 'noble') with the Greek concept of a noble, or honorable, death (Neyrey 287). Others note the sacrificial act of dying as that, which marks Jesus as the good shepherd, emphasizing, that his one-time sacrifice cannot be duplicated (Clemens 19; Beasely-Murray170). These arguments prove unpersuasive, however, because John uses 'kalos' to describe the shepherd's relationship and care for the sheep in addition to his sacrifice. This suggests that Jesus had in view more than just his sacrificial death when he spoke of the good shepherd, but intended rather to hold up his entire life and ministry as a model.

Furthermore, the assertion that Jesus intended his description of the good shepherd in John 10 to serve as a model for future leaders is supported by later appearances of shepherd language in John's gospel and the rest of the New Testament (Schnabel 379) and that the Good Shepherd discourse in John 10 presents Jesus as the model shepherd after whom future leaders should pattern themselves.

In this respect, Laniak and Sills have proposed a three-step construct that was seen in the life of Jesus, the Good Shepherd and how it is imperative for all leaders to always desire to provide leadership based on the three Cs namely: Content, Character and Competence. These three components are integral part of what an ideal leader should possess. It is also

against this background that Nigerian leaders would be assessed to determine the kind of leadership they provide for the people.

The first component of the biblical shepherd-leader profile is Content. Content in this context means 'contents' in other words, what is held 'within' or simply 'inside'. Character is what makes someone what he is (or she). It includes what they believe in, but also and most importantly, how they behave. It is similar to personality but tends to be used when considering whether someone is good or bad, and focuses on their actions (211). When Martin Luther King Jr said he looked forward to the day when all Americans would be judged solely "by the content of their character" he was talking about a person's essential qualities (Odey 52).

Content pertains mainly what the leader has and what he is made of, the substance of his being-ness. How he understands the situation and the challenges of the people he is called to provide leadership for. If it is in the pastoral sphere, how he has grasp of what is expected of him and if on the other hand, it is in the political sphere, the clarity of his understanding of the challenges and the anxieties of the people is paramount. As pastors and national leaders in various contexts, the issues must be prioritized and specific competencies must be needed to fulfill his role in a given context (Guder 308). Unfortunately, in Nigeria, since the period under discussion and even beyond, leadership has been bedeviled by selfishness, egocentrism and leaders have always shown that they lack content, that they do not understand the workings of the country or that they themselves are benefiting from the messy leadership they provide.

The second component of the biblical shepherd-leader profile is Character. Character here would mean the particular combination of qualities in a person or place that makes them different from others. It may be good or bad. Traits of good character includes

trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship (Othman 359). Biblically speaking, it may be argued that character is the most emphasized aspect of shepherd leadership. Scripture speaks extensively of the importance of the shepherd's character as revealed in his caring relationship toward the people under his leadership. In Psalm 23, God presents himself as the Shepherd of Israel, repeatedly emphasizing his comprehensive care for the wandering sheep through his gentleness, watchfulness, and provision (Bailey 63). Ezekiel 34 includes some of the strongest shepherd language in the Old Testament, but the language in this passage is a harsh condemnation of Israel's rulers. The chief accusation against these leaders was that they had neglected the people in their care. This contrast between the divine Shepherd and Israel's faithless shepherds carries directly into the Good Shepherd discourse in the New Testament (Laniak 210). Jesus described his perfect care for his people in terms of his willing sacrifice (10:11, 17-18), his close relationship with the sheep (10:14), his pursuit of the lost sheep (10:16), and his protection of the sheep (10:9, 28). Contrasted against the carelessness of the thieves and robbers who cared little for people, 'This intimacy of a shepherd and his flock provides a beautiful illustration of the trust, familiarity, and bond existing between Jesus and his followers' (Köstenberger 302). While character that is above reproach is prerequisite to leadership, the ways that care is expressed may vary according to the culture in which leaders are called to serve.

The third component of the biblical shepherd profile is Competence. This entails the ability to do something successfully or efficiently. It is a set of demonstrable characteristics and skills that enable and improve efficiency. It calls for the possession of required skill, knowledge, qualification and being able to do something well. This aspect of the profile explores exactly how a leader exercises shepherd leadership. Competence is the most practical of the three, and in many regards may be the most compelling to action-oriented. While the Bible consistently highlights matters of character as being of primary importance

in portraying shepherd leadership, it provides multiple examples of practical competencies that godly leaders are expected to possess. These abilities are not necessarily restricted to spiritual leadership, but may include administrative, governing, political or even military leadership as well (Laniak 22). The Psalms depict the Lord as a good shepherd who skillfully cares for his sheep by leading them through the dangerous wilderness (78:52), protecting and sheltering them (18:1-3), and providing sustenance and rest (23:1-2) (Bailey 65). Moses and David, as prototypes of the shepherd-leader, modeled several competencies that are associated with the role. David is described as a shepherd-ruler over Israel who 'guided them with his skillful hand' (Ps 78:72). In 1 Samuel 16, David is introduced as a young shepherd who already possesses the skills of soothing disturbed sheep (musicianship) and physically protecting the sheep from outside threats (Laniak 98). Looking again to John 10:1-18, the practical work of the Good Shepherd is observed in calling his sheep by name and leading them in and out of the pen (4), saving his sheep from thieves and robbers (8-9), laying down his life for the sheep (11), knowing his sheep in close relationship (14-15), and pursuing sheep who are separated from the flock (16).

Many writers such as Jones, Walter and Kishner have attempted to summarize and categorize the practical competencies associated with biblical descriptions of shepherd leadership. Reviewing the roles of Moses and David as human representatives of God's care for Israel, Laniak summarized their key shepherding tasks as protection, provision, and guidance (26). Golding includes each of these roles and adds the responsibilities of gathering sheep that are either lost or scattered (Golding 22).

The attributes and the components that are discussed pertaining the Good Shepherd, his Content, Character and Competence have become models of leadership in this work. The three major components are broken down into eight specific attributes and qualities of the

Good Shepherd as follows: Boundaries, exemplary life, trustworthiness, ability to provide and what to provide, sacrificial living, invested disposition, good relationship with the led and finally visionary in thought and actions. The Nigerian leaders and their administrations covered in this research will be discussed against these components and attributes. This discussion will be making reference to the Good Shepherd qualities in relation to the leaders and their leadership dispositions pointing out how they have almost always not lived as the Good Shepherd proposes. The attributes encapsulated in the text of John 10:1-18 are seen as the variables of analysis of these administrations. The factors that impeded (internal, personal inadequacies of the leaders) the application of these attributes in relation to the text are the real leadership challenges of the three leaders and their administrations. The administrations will be discussed with an introspection of the Good Shepherd components and attributes.

5.4 THE YEARS OF OLUSEGUN OBASANJO 1999-2007

Having established from the preceding section the three major characteristics of the Good Shepherd as Content, Character and Competence and further broken down into eight attributes as Boundaries, exemplary life, trustworthiness, ability to provide and what to provide, sacrificial living, invested disposition, good relationship and finally being visionary in thought and action, the discourse on President Olusegun Obasanjo, Umaru Musa Yar'Adua and Goodluck Jonathan will be hinged on these canon or measuring standard.

Many scholars of Nigerian political development have strongly often stated that President Chief Olusegun Obasanjo - so far, has been the luckiest Nigerian (leaving or dead). In a random interview ordinary Nigerians not of the elitist class have also agreed to this. For example, according to Azumi Kofarmata, he is traditional Chief; a Five Star General; a civil war hero; a former federal commissioner (minister) and member of Federal Executive Ruling Councils under two defunct military regimes; a former second in command under the defunct

military government headed by late General Murtala Muhammad; a former Head of State, Commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria (1976 – 1979) after the assassination of General Murtala Muhammad; a one-time condemned political prisoner under the defunct military government of late General Sani Abacha; a freed condemned political prisoner; a two-term Nigerian civilian President, Commander-in-chief, Armed forces of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999 – 2007); a national and international statesman and a successful modern large-scale commercial chicken farmer and strategic investor etc. This sums up the life history of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo (21). In the critique of Obasanjo administration, the researcher adopts the position of the devil's advocate, bringing out more the failures than the gains of his administration.

Yet, upon all this catalogued impressive résumé, Obasanjo's last and probably his final public outing as a contemporary Nigerian leader and head of government can best be characterized as not too good. Why did this happen and how will the future remember President Chief Obasanjo?

Inordinate and blind ambition and greed – these few words can best be used to answer the above question. This clearly set him below the ideals of the Good Shepherd characterised by sacrificial living, living for others and not for self. Such unbridled ambition was at disparity with the Good Shepherd. In the view of Evarist Muacha expressed in the National Daily, *The Nation* on August 9, 2007 gives an analysis how and why this happened. First, it is not the length of time in office which matters but what he did and did not do in office during his eight years tenure. Secondly, the quality and integrity in terms of accountability and transparency of what he did and the vision and maturity exhibited while providing leadership of the country counts in any assessment of his legacy especially viewed from the background of the Good Shepherd Discourse (8).

Having said that, it is pertinent also to briefly examine the political history of Nigeria since independence to buttress some points here. For example, it is a known fact that once in office the first thing Nigerian leaders do is to whittle down drastically, the constitutional powers and authority assigned to the other tiers and layers of governance of the country (Nwaeze 20). When the military was in power for instance, the first thing they did was to disband the parliament or National and State Assemblies and constrain the judicial arm of government while assuming supreme executive authority over everyone else.

Similarly, under Nigeria's democratic experimentations since 1979, the executive arms of government both at the federal and state levels tried as much as they could, to have domineering influence on the legislative and judicial arms of government. For example, from 1999 to 2007, almost all the State Governors exercised power and authority in their respective domains with very minimal oversight by the legislative arm of government (21).

At the federal level, the story was even worst. The reality was that what Nigeria went through during the eight years of President Obasanjo's supposedly democratic government was not fundamentally different from what Nigerians experienced during the over thirty-five years of military dictatorship in Nigeria since independence in 1960. According to Nwaeze, "the National Assembly was treated with disdain" (21) by President Obasanjo and his cohorts. This is one of the reasons why we found ourselves in the present mess where for example, President Obasanjo could tyrannically strip Nigerians of their hard-earned civil liberties; democratic rights to freely elect their leaders and unleash the worst form of excruciating and awful economic and social reforms in Nigeria since independence. …. asked, "By the way how can we run our country when we can't even conduct credible elections?" Therefore, the best starting point of assessment of President Obasanjo's legacy is the April 2007 "charade" in the name of general elections. It was continuing in the tradition of Nigeria's previous elections set by greedy, dishonest politicians and inept leaders. However, people interpreted

the results of the shambolic elections, it was clear that overwhelming Nigerians and the international observer groups had condemned the elections as severely flawed and did not meet the standards of acceptability anywhere in the democratic world and traditions (Bekah 34). This was seen in the many election petitions across the country and had been widely considered Obasanjo's lowest point. On the basis of trustworthiness displayed by the Good Shepherd, Obasanjo's administration seriously lacked in this regard. The poor election conducted and his assent to it became clear that he was not a man to be trusted.

The first positive legacy of Obasanjo's eight years that stood above all others, not begrudged even by his fiercest critics was largely paying off our sovereign debts to the Paris and London Clubs of creditor nations. This singular act was achieved largely by the political will Obasanjo provided to his economic team led by Mrs Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala. This showed the highest point and the very best of President Obasanjo's legacy of eight years of Nigeria's leadership (The Nation 24/5/2007).

In between the above mentioned lowest and highest points of Obasanjo's legacies were to be found other areas of achievements and failures as the case may be. However, within this spectrum, there seemed to be more failures than achievements. For example, some other major achievements and failures are highlighted and summarized in the table below. First compiled by Kofarmata, the table compares Nigeria's pre-1999 conditions against the 1999-2007 period of Obasanjo's presidency on a nominal scoring scale from very poor (1 point), poor (2 points), good (3 points), very good (4 points) and excellent (5 points). (Kofarmata 41).

S/N	**Policy/issue area**	**Pre-1999**	**1999 – 2007**
1.	Foreign debts/ Debts service management	Very poor (1 pt)	Excellent(5 pts)
2	Power sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
3	Telecommunications sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Good (3 pts)
4	Education sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
5	Health sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
6	Roads and Road transport sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)

7	Aviation sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
8	Rail transport sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
9	Marine transport and ports	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
10	Postal services	Very poor (1 pt)	Good (3 pt)
11	Personal Security and safety	Good (3 pts)	Very poor (1 pt)
12	Agricultural/Rural sector	Poor (2 pts)	Very poor (1 pt)
13	Water sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
14	Management of Niger Delta Restiveness	Poor (2 pts)	Very poor (1 pt)
15	Oil and Gas sector development	Poor (1 pt)	Poor (1 pt)
16	Oil and Gas revenues management: Transparency and accountability	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
17	Labour and industrial relations	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
18	Prisons reform	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
19	Police reform	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
20	Armed forces and Internal security	Good (3 pts)	Good (3 pts)
21	Housing & Urban sector	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
22	Banking/Financial sector	Good (3 pts)	Very good (4 pts)
23	Manufacturing sector	Poor (2 pts)	Very poor (1 pt)
24	Foreign investment & rating/Trade & Commerce	Poor (2 pts)	Good (3 pts)
25	Solid minerals sector	Poor (2 pts)	Poor (2 pts)
26	Tourism sector	Poor (2 pts)	Poor (2 pts)
27	Sports	Good (3 pts)	Poor (2 pts)
28	Drugs control/NAFDAC	Very poor (1 pt)	Excellent (5 pts)
29	Drugs control/NDLEA	Good (2 pts)	Good (3 pts)
30	Human & Child Trafficking	Very poor (1 pt)	Poor (2 pts)
31	Good governance and Corruption rating	Very poor (1 pt)	Poor (2 pts)
32	Human Rights record	Very poor (1 pt)	Very poor (1 pt)
33	Petroleum Products supply	Very poor (1 pt)	Poor (2 pts)
34	Pensions	Good (3 pts)	Poor (2 pts)
35	Foreign Affairs	Poor (2 pts)	Good (3 pts)
36	Employment/jobs	Poor (2 pts)	Very poor (1 pt)
37	Inflation level	Poor (2 pts)	Poor (2 pts)
38	Poverty	Poor (2 pts)	Very poor (1 pt)
39	Ethnic and Religious harmony	Good (3 pts)	Very Poor (1 pt)
40	Domestic debts payments	Poor (2 pts)	Good (3 pts)

It can be seen from the above table that President Obasanjo performed “very poor” in about 80 per cent of the selected policy areas during the eight years of his administration and leadership. The table is very simple and not based on any sophisticated statistical analysis but it provides an honest assessment that captures the feelings of the ordinary Nigerians; be they urban or rural dwellers, rich or poor, elites or ordinary blue and/or white-collar workers.

Wole Soyinka asserted that if you asked most grown up Nigerians to rate President Obasanjo's administration based on the above 40 selected policy and/or issues areas using the simple scoring system adopted here, you were likely to obtain a similar pattern of results produced in the table above; within a very small margin of errors and/ or deviations (Soyinka 3).

In retrospect, many Nigerians initially thought and believed that Nigeria was about to enter a new and better era with ushering of democracy in 1999 and with Chief Obasanjo leading the process. But the celebrations, excitement and goodwill were very brief and marred by the control-freak and egocentrism that became the trademarks of Obasanjo's presidency – a trait that would be visible throughout the eight years that followed (Ropher 51).

The table reveals a record of unprecedented serial policy failures across all sectors of the national political economy. For example, the woeful failure by President Obasanjo to tackle the problem of electricity supply was one of his greatest undoings. Trillions of naira were injected into the power sector in eight years and yet, the sector today is worse than prior to Obasanjo's administration. Therefore, President Obasanjo will be terribly remembered in this sector as a complete and abysmal failure. He failed to break the legendry curse and jinx of "Never Expect Power Always" (NEPA) that characterize the sector (Kofarmata 22).

Another major debit side of the ledger of Obasanjo's legacy was the awful failure of his over hyped economic and social reforms to produce tangible dividends to the majority of Nigerians. Instead, the benefits of the reforms were largely concentrated in a few sectors of the national economy and captured by a tiny class of business tycoons, those with the access to the corridors of power and those in strategic positions in the bureaucracy. As a result of this, the levels and intensity of hunger, poverty and unemployment and crimes had increased tremendously; with overwhelming Nigerians living on less than one US dollar a day

according to statistics produced by the statistical authorities of Nigeria, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the United Nations agencies, among others (21).

For example, one of the major flagships of Obasanjo's economic reform agenda was privatization of Federal Government owned enterprises across all sectors of the national space economy. However, the implementation of the privatization policy left much to be desired as all the choice companies, properties and businesses were auctioned off at ridiculous prices to family members, friends and cronies of the Presidency. Therefore, the man who said his administration will not be business as usual got himself mired in allegations of sleaze and abuse of office, nepotism and parochialism in his conduct of economic deregulation and liberalization policies. The Petroleum Technology Development Fund (PTDF) scandal, corruption in the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC), sales of federal government owned residential houses and properties, Transcorp and Presidential Library debacles are just few examples of albatrosses hanging on Obasanjo's legacy (Ekpu 21). The points above show almost very clearly that Obasanjo did not have the ability to provide especially what was needed as a Good Shepherd would lead the sheep to refreshing waters and pasture. It therefore, goes to say that Obasanjo did not have the competence to provide the needed leadership.

Ekpu further asserts that the rigid controlling from the command and control centre at Aso Rock executive desk of Mr President; the one-man knows it all government by Obasanjo in which he and he alone, initiated policies and determined who and how such policies were designed and implemented; thereby bypassing civil service convention, professional bureaucrats, technocrats and technical advisers did not make him any better for it. As a result of this, the formal procedures of governance were compromised in a number of instances. President Obasanjo's direct control of Nigeria's foreign Affairs and control of the Ministry of Petroleum Resources were good examples of his impulse to centralize and dominate

governmental affairs at all times. That is why, for example, since 1999 Nigeria did not have any well-articulated and focused foreign policy anchored on any philosophical foundation (22). This was a clear scenario of lack of Character on his part to lead.

According to Abdullahi Muazo, another major debit side of Obasanjo's legacy was his tempestuous relationship with his Vice President, Atiku Abubakar. It all started on a very sound footing during the first term in office. Initially, their personal friendship and official relationship had been like no other in politics, as intimate and lasting as a marriage. In fact, at one time, Obasanjo likened the relationship to *Auren Zobe*, which, in Hausa means indissoluble marriage – until death does us apart! The budding relationship between the two national leaders was unusual because it drew on a sustained intimacy throughout the first term (1999 – 2003) compared with the fractious relationships existing between many State Governors and their deputies. But suddenly, the cordial relationship plunged and completely shattered before the very eyes of their friends, admirers and foes in politics and the public at large (71).

The roots of the sudden dissolution of the indissoluble *Auren Zobe* laid in 2003 when Vice President Atiku Abubakar encouraged by a large crowd of his friends, who were Governors, indicated his interest to contest the 2003 Presidential election; assuming President Obasanjo was not going for a second term in office based on an agreed one-term and power shift deal secretly sealed some time in 1999 between Obasanjo and some northern Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) politicians. Although Vice President Atiku Abubakar decided not to run for the presidency against Obasanjo in 2003 that was the time when both started to lose faith in their friendship and cordial relationship (73).

However, it was the ill-fated Obasanjo's purported Third Term agenda that finally broke the camel's back in their personal friendship and official relationship. President Obasanjo resented at the way Vice President Atiku Abubakar behaved on this matter.

Therefore, the Third Term debacle became the fault line of the cordial relationship existing between the *duo*, "work with me and you will have my blessing" was Obasanjo's message to his now recalcitrant Vice President. This breakdown in the hitherto cordial relationship between them significantly impacted negatively in the current political quagmire the country faced arising from the April 2007 flawed general elections. Hence this posed a great threat to peace and stability in Nigeria and its democratic experiment (35).

In conclusion, the table above shows that the catalogued serial policy failures far outweigh the very few policy achievements of Obasanjo's eight years in command and control of Nigeria's political and economic arenas. Therefore, Obasanjo's legacy is one that can be said to be a legacy full of failed promises and expectations to say the least. His successor must start from almost ground- zero rather than continuing with the existing failed policies and programmes

Nigerians were and are still divided over how to assess the Obasanjo regime. There were many people whose reviews were coloured by ideological differences, pure hatred and some measure of feelings of victimhood. Whatever one may say, the former President has to shoulder all that has become associated with his regime. Clearly, it seemed strange that from the likes of General Babangida and Northern cabal which was said to have wheeled him from Yola prisons to the State house, only an insignificant few remained on his side of the divide by the end of his tenure. There might be various reasons, but clearly, everyone could not be wrong. On the economy, his politics, his domestic and international politics, there is still much to be debated and these volumes will be made up of various shapes and sizes of encomiums or sheer calumny, depending on where one is standing (Kofarmata 33).

The concern of the researcher in this sub-heading has been to show how the President missed so many great opportunities to consolidate his administration and help citizens

appreciate public policies as they concerned them. And to put it in the context of the research, how he had failed to be a good and noble shepherd with the primary responsibility of taking care of his flock. The researcher is aware of personal limitations in terms of what information is available. But, in fairness, it seems that the issues are more complex than may have been presented. Many would argue that perhaps his military background may have made him intolerable to contrary opinions and that while his Yoruba background made him feel that age was synonymous with wisdom, his vast international networks also led him to think that he did not need to court the views of the idealistic young men and women who manned the barricades of civil society.

We can argue that with hindsight, it would seem that *ab initio*, President Obasanjo was clearly a reluctant democrat at heart. In the eight years of his governance, within the ruling Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) over which he presided, the President seemed obsessed with getting his way at all cost. So, accusation of blackmail, arm-twisting, dictatorship, autocracy rang in the air in most assessments of him by friends and foes. In the first four years, the PDP had three Chairmen, the Senate had three Senate Presidents, all because the President disagreed with these gentlemen. Clearly, as noted above, his military background got in the way of all his dealings with the challenges posed by his leadership style. Thus, as can be seen, the President undertook many wonderful initiatives all aimed at opening up the democratic space and consolidating democracy, but his personal aversion to the quantum of freedom available to citizens made him behave as if Nigerians could accept his excesses because they were for their own good. I believe that on many scores, it is likely that history will judge the President fairly. But that depends on if he can arrange to tell his own side of the story before sun set (Ekpu 31).

In relation to the topic of research, it is pertinent to discuss briefly how Obasanjo's presidency did not protect lives, as good and noble shepherd would do. The Odi Massacre: Odi, a town on the bank of the famous River Nun, popularised in one of Gabriel Okara's poems, has a population of over 60,000. The inhabitants engage in fishing, farming, harvesting and processing of oil palm produce and trading. And it is a host community to Shell Petroleum Development Company, which controls three oil wells there. Early in November, 1999, some youths abducted and killed 14 policemen. Thereafter, Obasanjo issued a 14-day ultimatum to the government of Bayelsa State to produce the killers or he, Obasanjo, would proclaim a state of emergency (35).

Before the expiration of this ultimatum, however, Obasanjo ordered troops into Odi and the surrounding villages. The soldiers cordoned off the East-West Road by the Orashi River at Mbiama and by the River Niger at Patani, after which they began a major military operation with the use of heavy artillery, aircraft, grenade launchers, mortar bombs and other sophisticated weapons. According to the Civil Liberties Organization, a human rights non-governmental organization, which visited the area after, "So ruthless, savage and thorough was the operation that it could only have been intended to achieve a genocidal outcome." CLO added that two weeks after the operation, the stench of decomposing bodies dumped into various creeks could still be perceived one kilometre from the town. And every house in the entire community, with the exception of the First Bank, a Community Health Centre and the Anglican Church, were burnt down (Ekpu 41).

But the Obasanjo government defended itself. The invasion, code-named *Operation Hakuri II* by the then Minister of Defence, General T.Y. Danjuma, was "initiated with the mandate of protecting lives and property–particularly oil platforms, flow stations, operating rig terminals and pipelines refineries and power installation in the Niger Delta" (42)

As if that was not enough, between Monday, 22 October and Wednesday October 24, 2001, Obasanjo unleashed similar mayhem on Zaki Biam, Vaase, Anyiin, Gbeji and Sankara in Benue State for the same reason–alleged murder of some soldiers. Amnesty International said, "The government of Nigeria must…condemn the killings publicly and make it clear that those responsible will be held accountable." But Obasanjo told the Financial Times, on 9 April 2002, that when you send in soldiers, "they do not go on a picnic", adding "in human nature, reaction is always more than the action."

This direct termination of lives of hundreds of people stands at variance with the disposition of the good and noble shepherd who determined to protect his flock would willingly risk his life. The shepherd guards and guides the flock and promises that he has come that they may have life and have it to the full. It is a completion of the principles of the good shepherd.

Against the backdrop of the components and attributes of the Good Shepherd, the pattern and style of leadership of the Obasanjo administration fell short of the Content, Character and Competence components of the Good Shepherd. The attributes of the Good Shepherd were hardly seen in his leadership style. Unfortunately, his natural qualities and his military background made him to be forceful and aggressive in his approach, desire to give command, and not the gentle voice of the shepherd that would make the sheep to hear and follow. His radicalism and brutality towards the people showed that he may not have been ready to lay down his life for them like the Good Shepherd laying down his life for the sheep.

5.5 FROM UMARU MUSA YAR'ADUA TO GOODLUCK JONATHAN 2007-2015

> At a slippery point in time in Nigeria's history and indeed the history of Africa, where decent leadership is elusive and desperation triumphs; where the people have given up on integrity and the possibility of upright anti corrupt leadership. A time where many ask, what can be better, and is it possible to deliver more for the people and less for the cabal; it becomes valuable to revisit the leaderships of our past and study if possibly there were better legacies, better examples to compare, and greater natures of human beings to emulate and seek in the present-future (Nuruddeen 4).

The above assertion brings us into the presidency of Umaru Musa Yar'Adua. Looking not too far into the past, in fact into the 4th republic, and from this ruling APC party, the much overlooked, abbreviated regime of late President Umaru Yar'adua comes to the fore. A characteristic of a good legacy is when your words and actions of the past are raised as measures and standards in determination of the problems of the future. Late Umaru Yar'Adua in this regard, as invoked in the national discussion, left a good and important legacy.

That President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua came to office with impeccable pedigree is beyond dispute. At his inauguration on May 29, 2007, he stated that the philosophy of his administration would be anchored on the principle of the rule of law and due process. In his first few weeks in office, President Yar'Adua's action left no one in doubt that the rule of law was, for him, an article of faith as well as his covenant with the Nigerian people. According to Adeniyi, it was also very clear to the people in government, especially in the administration's early days, that the president indeed subscribed to the time-honoured view that society will flourish when governed according to law rather than by the whims of the office holders (3). His presidency spanned from May 29, 2007 to May 5, 2010. Undoubtedly, Yar'adua's three years as president were legendary, basically due to his frugal disposition to life, meticulousness to details and commitment to service. Many Nigerians believed Yar'adua

meant well for the country, but not a few also raised concerns over what they saw as his slow approach to governance and therefore named him “Baba Go slow” (7).

Yar’adua was the one who rolled out the Amnesty Programme which saw hundreds of Niger Delta youths going abroad for studies and professional training. Many of them have since returned to Nigeria as reformed citizens while others are making positive impact in various fields of endeavour across the world. Yar’adua deconstructed power because he was not intoxicated by it, a fact that even his critics have attested to. He did not pay lip service to the rule of law and due process he preached. Under his watch, the courts regained their freedom. They handed down verdicts that cancelled political victories even though his party, the People’s Democratic Party (PDP) was the victim.

Yar’Adua had an uphill task. The first president to publicly declare his assets, Yar’Adua was referred to as ‘go-slow,’ possibly because at the time, people did not realize what cards he had been handed and it was actually due to his attention to details and due process. He was coming in when oil prices were dropping during the global recession and Nigeria’s economy faced testing times. The Yar’Adua government had to stabilize the economy against dropping oil prices and decreased production as a result of Niger-Delta terror.

Yar’Adua had been handed two catastrophic problems by the predecessor Obasanjo government. Movement for Emancipation of the Niger Delta, MEND was wreaking havoc in the Southern creeks and Boko Haram had similarly evolved in the North East. To tackle the Niger Delta crisis, an Amnesty was worked out for the agitating youth who had reduced Nigeria’s oil output by almost half, as Nigeria invested billions in training and rehabilitating these youth. Peace that eluded Obasanjo was restored to the creeks. Furthermore, he went into properly considering the dynamics of the northern question. Poverty is predominant in Nigeria’s North, however poverty and/or misguided fanaticism is no excuse for terrorism and

murder of innocent civilians and security officers. The nation's security men were sent to sack the Boko Haram camps in a swift and efficient operation. These efforts brought calm to the two areas. Having established calm and restored security to Nigeria, late Yar'Adua continued with managing other pressing crises he had inherited from the previous administration (Nuruddeen 78).

But as he waged this war, he suddenly took seriously ill and became inefficient while in office. The crisis that led to the emergence of the then Vice President, Goodluck Jonathan through the 'Doctrine of Necessity' may not be fully addressed here. But suffice it to say that, according to Adeniyi, the enduring lesson of the Yar'Adua years is that there are always potential landmines when a nation elects a leader who has to constantly worry about his health. Robert Robins and Jerrold Post reveal, with practical examples drawn from several centuries, in their book, *When Illness Strikes the Leader: The Dilemma of the Captive King.* When such a leader comes with the additional baggage of a discredited election, then not only will he be distracted, chances are that he will also be vulnerable to all manner of people with vested interests masquerading as do-gooders. That was very evident in Yar'Adua's case, as he was pre-occupied with the issues of both political and personal survival right from his first day in office (Adeniyi xxvii).

The three years of Musa Yar'Adua's leadership may have appeared glorious but measured against the components and attributes of the Good Shepherd, one would be right to say that the years were not truly glorious. He never had the competence *ab initio* to seek to lead because he was a sick man and the demands of the office further compounded his problem and created a serious leadership hurdle for him. Furthermore, the circumstances surrounding his ill health and eventual death showed that he was not someone who could be trusted. Otherwise, his ailing health could have made him to resign since he was no longer able to cope with the demands of office. This would have created a very transparent president.

During his ordeal he was sometimes nocturnally brought in or taken out and people were not sufficiently informed of the president's health and lived more on speculation. When he eventually died, it was all the more shrouded in secrecy and it almost created crisis in the bid that the Vice President would take over leadership. The spirit of sacrifice for the good of the people was absent.

5.6 THE YEARS OF GOODLUCK JONATHAN 2010-2015

Taking over as President of Nigeria after the demise of Umaru Musa Yar'Adua in May 2010, the administration of ex-President Goodluck Jonathan can at best be described as underperforming, a review of its performance in various sectors show this reality. According to Ibekwe, this can be described as unfortunate for a government which came to power on the back of popular support and one that enjoyed a lot of public goodwill in its early years. Here the researcher shall briefly discuss eleven ways the administration failed Nigerians and, in many cases, left the country worse than it met it. For Ibekwe, the administration had proved grossly incapable of understanding Nigeria's problem or better put, tried to answer questions no one was asking, this resulted in the many policy summersault experienced by the Jonathan administration.

(a) Power Generation

In 2010, when Mr Jonathan was sworn in as substantive president after the death of his former boss, Umaru Yar'Adua, power generation in Nigeria was 3,000 megawatts (The Guardian, 12). On Friday, when he was handing over to his successor, power generation had dropped to less than 2000 megawatts. The need to prioritise power generation and availability to Nigerians was acknowledged by Mr Jonathan early in his administration. In 2011, while seeking support to be elected president after leading the country for one year following the

death of Mr. Yar'Adua, the ex-president declared to diplomats at the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, UNECA, and the African Union, AU, in Addis-Ababa that:

> If I'm voted into power, within the next four years, the issue of power will become a thing of the past. Four years is enough for anyone in power to make a significant improvement and if I can't improve on power within this period, it then means I cannot do anything.

Power across Nigeria was at an all-time low with Abuja, the Federal Capital Territory, having just 5 megawatts as at the time his administration terminated. This was not a positive thing in his administration.

(b) Security

This was perhaps Mr. Jonathan's biggest albatross. His administration went to sleep while the insurgent group, Boko Haram, ran amok killing thousands and capturing territory as huge as Belgium from Nigeria in its bid to create an Islamic caliphate. Jonathan only acted decisively when it became clear that the insurgency would cost him votes during the presidential election. In the buildup to the elections in 2015, within six weeks, most of the territories previously captured by the insurgents were retaken and the insurgents placed on a back foot.

The president also failed to curb the perennial clashes between Fulani herdsmen and farmers particularly in the north central region. In Nasarawa, Ombatse militia were allowed to rain terror on civilians. In 2013 over 100 police officers and other security agents were killed in a swoop by the militia. The Jonathan administration, for political reasons, refused to bring the perpetrators to book and those indicted for the killings still walk free today (Adeniyi 63).

The insecurity was also witnessed in the southern part of the country as kidnappers went on rampage abducting people for ransom. Politicians, their aides, family members and public officials were the major targets as the criminals virtually had their way in various states like Edo, Bayelsa, and Ondo State. Under the Jonathan administration, Nigeria became one of the most dangerous places in the world to live. In the opinion of Horgan Moure, Nigeria became a shadow of herself in terms of security (66).

(c) Fuel Scarcity

In his article in *Daily Sun*, Ahmed Saud'ai asserted that that Nigeria was grounded to a halt after oil marketers embarked on a strike following dispute over subsidy on petrol at the dawn of a New Year. Despite several promises by Mr. Jonathan to increase the nation's capacity to refine crude by revamping the existing refineries and building new ones, no new refineries were built in his five years in office while existing ones never worked at optimum capacity. The continued reliance on imported fuel left the country susceptible to the machinations of oil marketers. Subsidy on petrol and kerosene also turned out to be a black hole on the country's finances. He concluded that in five years, the administration spent over N6 trillion on subsidy, money that could have been used for other essential developments (Ahmed 12).

(e) Corruption

After the unforgivable lapses in security especially in the North-East, corruption was another factor that Mr. Jonathan could not get a grip on, or deliberately allowed to flourish under his administration. Aides and ministers accused of corruption were either shielded or allowed to stay in their position.

The granting of presidential pardon to former governor of Bayelsa State, Diepreye Alamieyeseigha, who was convicted of money laundering, sparked outrage among Nigerians. He also did nothing, until too late, when former Aviation Minister, Stella Uduah, bought two armoured BMW cars for N255 million. When he eventually acted, he only removed the former minister from office without ordering or calling for her prosecution. Also, instead of investigating the alleged N20 billion the former Governor of the Central Bank of Nigeria, Lamido Sanusi, said was missing from the accounts of the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, NNPC, Mr. Jonathan hounded him out of office and the matter died a natural death (Ibekwe 27).

(f) Crude oil theft

During the Jonathan administration, pirates and crude oil thieves were lords. Pirates surrounded the Nigerian waterways like water hyacinth stealing crude from the country's pipelines with little or no hindrance. The ill-equipped and poorly trained navy proved to be grossly incapable of arresting the situation. Instead of training and adequately equipping the navy and other security agencies to protect the country's source of wealth, the task of pipeline protection was handed to militias in the Niger Delta and elsewhere for several billions of naira annually. Yet, instead of the theft of oil to decrease it remained a major drain of resources. According to the Chief of Naval Staff, Usman Jibrin, the country lost crude valued more than N1.18 billion daily to oil thieves (N433.62 billion annually) (Adeniyi 67).

(g) Economy

Mr. Jonathan could not sustain the modest economic growth recorded by his government initially. He could not save for the rainy day when the price of crude oil reached very high levels; subsequently depleting Nigeria's foreign reserves and incurring a huge debt

profile as soon as there was a dip in the price of crude in the international market. Mr. Jonathan inherited as much as $60 billion in foreign reserve but plundered it to as low as $40 billion in five years. According Joan Uruah, as at June 2014, the country's external debt rose by 40 per cent to $9.377 billion and a domestic debt of $47.653 billion. Though inflation was kept at a single digit, it was a faux strength as companies struggled to survive and the country continually ranked poorly in the ease of doing business index by the World Bank (34). Despite his promises, again he could not revive the manufacturing sector. Companies complained of incurring huge cost due to their reliance on diesel. The textile industry remained moribund. Poverty remained widespread and youth employment was at an all-time high (39).

(h) Foreign Relations

Under Mr. Jonathan, Nigeria's foreign relations was in sixes and sevens. There was no clear foreign relation direction as the country gradually lost its clout in the international community. Nigeria was left with a bloody nose after the South African government seized its $15 million arms money illegal brought into South Africa in cash. At the twilight of Jonathan's administration, the South African government also ridiculed Nigeria's shoddy recall of her ambassador to South Africa following the xenophobic violence there. Also, the Moroccan government recalled its ambassador to Nigeria after officials of the latter's foreign ministry lied about a telephone conversation between Mr. Jonathan and King Mohammed VI of Morocco (Uruah 40).

(i) Education

The Jonathan government showed some signs that it was interested in turning around the education sector by increased budgetary allocations and other acts; but this did not make

much impact. Nigeria still has the highest number of children out of school in the world; while for close to an academic session, the country's universities were shut due to the government's refusal to meet the demands of striking university teachers.

The country's universities were still as dilapidated as at the time he assumed office while the new ones set up fared no better. Hundreds of thousands of polytechnic students stayed at home for about one year due to no fault of theirs, same for those in Colleges of Education. Standards in the country's universities and other colleges virtually fared no better than Mr. Jonathan met them (Chioma 12).

(j) Health

Many Nigerians still die of preventable diseases such as cholera and dysentery. Infant and maternal mortality may have reduced during the Jonathan administration, but they are still among the highest in the world. At least 65 out of every 1000 Nigerian children die before their fifth birthday. For every 100,000 live births, more than 224 mothers lost their lives (Ahmed 14).

The National Health Insurance Scheme was yet to be fully operational while hospitals had become so bad that some politicians travel abroad to treat common illnesses. Health workers were consistently demanding for better welfare and hospitals were sometimes shut for weeks due to industrial action, and the agitation by health workers for better equipment and further training.

(k) Mining

While the country binged on oil, the less fancied but lucrative mining sector was virtually neglected and left unregulated. The sector was taken over by illegal miners who

cashed in on government's complete neglect of the sector sometimes with devastating repercussions on host communities. Hundreds of Nigerian children died due to outbreaks of lead poisoning in States like Zamfara and Niger due to artisan mining (Ahmed 14).

(l) His Patience

In the view of Chioma Gabriel, behind every successful man is a woman and for any problem a man encounters in his lifetime, a woman somewhere must have played a major role. Anywhere Jonathan's success or otherwise story is told, Dame Patience will be featured prominently (12). She was part of his success story and part of his problems just as much. She was his asset as well as his greatest familial undoing. There was nothing Nigerians did not use Dame Patience Jonathan, the beautiful wife of the President's name to do. Cartoonists, comedians, political critics had had cause to find in her a veritable weapon both for their jokes and against her husband's government. The issue was, for the most part, Dame Jonathan did not appear to understand when to lend a hand to her husband and when to stand aside and so for many times contributed in heating an issue that would have been treated differently. Unfortunately, she did not learn lessons from some of her careless outbursts. And her assistants perhaps may have contributed to the problem by not advising her that sometimes, silence is golden (Chioma 14).

After the death of Musa Yar'Adua and the emergence of the Goodluck Jonathan's leadership Nigeria took a direction for the worse (16). Using the canon of measurement of the Goodluck administration, one experienced a situation where a leader was not sure of what to do and perhaps did not understand the enormity of the Nigerian problem. The Content, Character and Competence component were called to question. Those who perceived him as not knowing what to do called him "clueless". But a leader should know what to do at every turn of the way. Under his watch, security had degenerated. The one incident that overtly and graphically exposed the ineptitude, ineffectiveness and incompetence of Goodluck Jonathan

was the abduction of about 276 school girls from Chibok in Borno State by Boko Haram. The reaction and attitude of the president and his household was non-belief and denial of the reality that had struck, to the extent that eighteen days passed before he grudgingly conceded to accept the reality of the abduction. If serious action had been taken within 48 hours, the story could have been different. The Good Shepherd cares for his flock and this was clearly lacking in this and many other instances.

Jonathan was lacking in broad visionary leadership, knowledge, confidence, understanding, concentration, capacity, sense of security, political sagacity, courage, moral and ethical principles, character and passion to move the nation forward on a fast trajectory. The fact of corruption was a clear case of leader desiring to get too much from the system.

In the history of Nigerian Presidents, Goodluck Jonathan had the highest academic qualification, it was left to be seen that he efficiently applied it in his leadership style. For example, it was difficult to tolerate sometimes the verbosity of his wife. There was a thin line between his family and issues of public policy so much that critics of his government said that there were five presidents in Nigeria, and these were his wife the first lady, Deziani Allison, Stella Oduah, Ngozi Iweala and the president himself, and that he was the weakest of the five. This could be an unfair assessment of a President, but it says of the kind of influence others had on him (Adeniyi 42).

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 SUMMARY

The reference text of John 10:1-18 that highlights the 'The Good Shepherd Discourse' occurred in the context of the polemics against unfaithful and bad leadership structures in Israel. The text draws from three main separate but connected epochs in biblical tradition. Jesus must have drawn the 'Good Shepherd Discourse' from the negligence and exploitation of Israel by her leaders as was strongly denounced by Old Testament prophets especially Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Jer 23:1-8, Ezek 34). The former was the remote background. The latter, which was the proximate cause had to do with the Jewish authorities of Israel especially the Pharisees who felt they had their sight but was in fact blind without knowing it. Their blindness was manifested in the high-handed manner in which they treated the congenitally blind man by expelling him from the synagogue. Against this background, Jesus reveals himself as the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for his sheep unlike the hireling who flees at the sight of the wolf (vv. 11-12). He also shows the intimate relationship, which exists between him and the people and between him and the Father (vv. 14-15). As the Good Shepherd, the God of Israel is present in the person of Christ to enlighten and save the people he calls "my own" (v. 14). As the ideal shepherd, Jesus not only sums up all the qualities of a good shepherd but above all vicariously lays down his life for the sheep (vv. 15, 18). Moreover, Jesus brings them into union with the Father through his union with the sheep.

Nigeria is blessed with natural and human resources, and ethnic diversity that would have been positively used for her growth and development. However, the story is not so even after more than fifty years of Independence. In its over 50 years of independence, the nation

has had a chequered political history characterized by eight military regimes and democratic attempts at various times. The failure of these democratic experiments has been linked to poor culture of democratic practice, lack of sacrifice, poor leadership recruitment process, ethnicity, corruption and religious bigotry. In the context of the challenges of leadership in Nigeria, Jesus shows that the most distinguishing mark of a good leader is the disposition and willingness to make sacrifices for the people. There is no limit to the sacrifices for the people. It is the lack of sacrifice by our leaders like the Good Shepherd that more often than not, they have neglected the led and abandoned them to the wolves of rapacity. The components and the attributes of the Good Shepherd are nearly absent in Nigerian leaders who have occupied the highest position of President.

There is however no limit to the sacrifice a good leader may be called upon to make for the good of the people. He may not only risk his or her life but may actually lose it for the good of the people. This is the climax of all sacrifices. “No one can have greater love than to lay down his life for his friends” (15: 13). Violence in many States and communities has become the lot of our people. Issues are further compounded by corrupt practices of many political office holders. Corruption has been the greatest social sickness of the Nigerian leaders being responsible for lack of development and growth. The method leaders emerge may have been a contributory factor to leadership failure in Nigeria. Furthermore, the challenge of ethnicity has become a clog in the wheel of our leadership drive. Instead of using these as a point of convergence, unfortunately, they have almost always kept Nigerians farther from one another. Leaders have become tribal and religious leaders to the detriment of national leaders with the objective of national cohesion. The Good Shepherd model of leadership should be emulated as a sure way of overcoming the leadership challenges found in Nigeria.

6.2 CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

This research has dealt and treated the discourse of John 10:1-18 which is the Good Shepherd Discourse and has seen the heroic and selfless, sacrificial disposition of the Good Shepherd visa-a-vis leadership failure in Nigeria. The Good Shepherd comes in sharp contrast with Nigerian leaders who may best be described as hirelings who are pre-occupied with self-preservation.

The work has also made effort to establish how leadership in Nigeria leaves much to be desired since the country gained her independence in 1960 through the years of the military junta, and more specifically from 1999-2015. However, there are signs of recovery if certain aspects of enthroning democracy and good governance are made to function properly. The work has established that the leadership model of the Good Shepherd is not just a biblical construct but can indeed, become an exemplar of universal ideal leadership. The components of Content, Character and Competence and the eight attributes of the Good Shepherd are set as model from which true leadership must take its bearing.

This work also analyzed what it holds as a major contributory factor in relation to leadership failure to be corruption and ethnicity. In addition, the work has established that the leadership recruitment process must be improved upon. On the fight against corruption, the work upheld the duty and responsibility of Code of Conduct Bureau (CCB) and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) and asserts that corruption is sinking the Nation no doubt because it has cut across all spheres of governance in Nigeria.

This work however, does not presume to have exhausted discussions on the challenges of leadership in Nigeria. However, the attempt made will assist to proffer a solution especially now that Nigeria is moving into an election year. It is hoped that the new crop of leaders who will emerge at the polls will adopt this leadership model as exemplified in the Good Shepherd.

Apart from the above contribution to knowledge, the research has been able to put the model of the Good Shepherd as a universal model of leadership and particularly a national model for all leaders in Nigeria. This is not to seem as if the research was presumptuous that all Nigerian leaders are Christians to be able to draw lessons from the Good Shepherd. But it is because the attributes of Content, Character and Competence, sacrifice, care for the vulnerable and altruistic disposition found in the Good Shepherd are good attributes for all times and places and for all people of different faith backgrounds.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

i. Leaders and especially political leaders must have the Content, Character and Competence to lead. Those who desire to take up political leadership must first sit to ask self-examining questions based on the model of leadership proposed by the Good Shepherd. First, what are they made of? This will help to bring out the Content of would-be leaders. What is their disposition to leadership? What is their character orientation? Are they competent for the office they aspire to occupy? So, the first set of recommendation is for leaders to have the Content, Character and Competence to lead. The self-examining questions will tell the aspiring leader whether or not he has passed the test. He would go further to consider the external challenges of leadership in Nigeria such as corruption and ethnicity and come to terms with them.

ii. Leaders must be ready to sacrifice. Leadership is about rendering service to people. Those who desire to take up leadership positions must be people who are disposed to sacrifice for the good of the people. Personal aggrandizement in the course leadership falls short of what the Good Shepherd exemplified in his life. The Good Shepherd chooses personal sacrifice and inconvenience for the welfare of his sheep. The same must be seen of contemporary leaders in Nigeria. They must willingly experience personal sacrifice for the benefit of those they lead.

iii. Leaders must know their boundaries. For the Good Shepherd, there is a sheep pen within which only his sheep may enter. There are appropriate ethical, moral and other boundaries that leaders need to establish and maintain for the good of those they lead. They have to be visionary and trustworthy to command followership. The caring attitude and voice of the leader would elicit confidence in those that encounter him as a leader. Leaders must provide the needs of the people just as the Good Shepherd would lead his flock to pasture. He must have a clear vision for the future and lead people to it in the way that the Shepherd leads his flock to where they eat and drink water.

iv. Prospective leaders must go through detail scrutiny before being allowed at the altar of leadership. There should be a more thorough and transparent process by which leaders emerge and they should have a track record of leadership that can be trusted with the burden of leadership. Closely linked is the resolve and disposition of Nigerians that leaders should be derived from across the length and breadth of Nigeria and from any tribe or ethnic group. The factor of religion should not determine this process provided the disposition to service and sacrifice can be sufficiently established. A total re-orientation of our value system, especially strong moral upbringing from childhood to maturity should be espoused. Those

aspiring for positions of leadership must first examine themselves, what motivates them and the people they lead should be given a chance to accept them or not.

v. Leaders must live exemplary lives, must seek genuinely to have good relationship with the led and be visionary in thought and action. Those who are vested with the responsibility of leadership should be honestly interested in the well-being of the people. The Shepherd is interested in the sheep and stays with the sheep and even lays down his life for them. Leaders should provide leadership based on the qualities and attributes of the Good Shepherd as discussed in the text of John 10:1-18.

vi. Leaders must be like the Good Shepherd who loves his sheep and develops a close relationship with them. They must understand the needs of the flock and what threatens them, comfort them when they are hurt or fearful and keeps them from fighting and hurting each other. Nigerian leaders must be disposed to seek the health, well-being and prosperity of the flock and gently lead those that cannot meet up with the pace of others.

6.4 CONCLUSION

Leadership in Nigeria has almost always been characterized by failure. The expectations of the people of their leaders have been a story of disappointment. From within the last democratic dispensation, part of which was dealt with in this research, from 1999-2015, Nigerians have not had it better even as they have been colonized by the neo-colonialists, taking undue advantage of the people's docility. This has largely been attributed to the left overs of the military.

The Old Testaments prophets, Ezekiel and Jeremiah decried the attitude of the shepherds of Israel, who had abandoned the people to perish and were rather exploiting them. They saw a future when Yahweh will lead his own people and care for them. Through other

Old Testament figures like the Kings, God continued to care for his people. The culmination of all was seen in Jesus who proclaims that 'I am the Good Shepherd …' The leadership failure has created disenchantment and apathy among the people which could be the remote cause of the crisis Nigeria is facing in the areas of insurgency.

For, if we do not have leaders who are ready to sacrifice for the people there will continue to exist political crisis in the nation which may one day degenerate to violent conflict and may lead to international displacement of the citizens of Nigeria, the resultant humanitarian and security crisis will be too frightening to contemplate. The emergence of leaders through a distilled process will go a long way of tackling the leadership crisis in Nigeria. The Nigeria's political history has shown that the shepherd model of political leadership has eluded the country. Contemporary leaders at the various levels of governance in Nigeria are nothing but profiteers, syndicates whose activities and disposition do not promote the well-being of all Nigerians.

The research has placed the imagery of the Good Shepherd and hireling in opposition. The Good Shepherd leadership is characterized by sacrifice and goodwill for the people as against the hireling who stays only for his advantage and gain and not to care and protect the sheep. Ultimately, the Good Shepherd Discourse is an indictment of the hirelings as well as a challenge to all current and prospective leaders.

WORKS CITED

Abela, Emmanuel T. *Leadership: A Christian Perspective*. Makurdi: Franco D. Press, 2016. Print.

Aberach, Bryan. *The Role of Shepherds in Ancient East World-view*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980. Print.

Achebe, Chinua. *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd. 1983. Print.

Achtemeier, Paul J, Joel Green, and Marianne Meye Thompson. *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001. Print.

Adams, Jay E. *Shepherding God's Flock* London: Geoffrey Chapman, 2009. Print.

Adebayo, A. *Power in Politics*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books, 2004. Print.

Adeosun, A. B. "Nigeria @50: The Role of Good Governance and Effective Public Administration Towards Achieving Economic Growth and Stability in Fledging Democracy". *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance* Volume 3, No.3.3 Quarter III, 2012. Print.

Adeniyi, Olusegun. *Power, Politics & Death: A Front-row Account of Nigeria under the Late President Yar'Adua*. Lagos: Kachifo Limited, 2011. Print.

Adibe, J. "Exorbitant Party Nomination Forms and Systemic Corruption". *Daily Trust* 2014. Print.

Ahmed, Saud'ai. *The Daily Sun*. September 17, 2013. Print.

Agbese, Dan. "The Followership as an Accomplice." *Newswatch*. October 4, 2010. Print.

Agbor, Tompson, *Leadership Practice and the Error Silence*. Lagos: Sovereign 2016. Print.

Agomuo, Z. *The Leadership Question*. Enugu: SNAAP Press, 2013. Print.

Akangba, Hassan. *Election, Democracy and the People.* Nairobi: Kolbe Press, 2004. Print.

Ake, Claude. *Democracy and Development in Africa.* Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1996. Print.

Alechenu, J. "Quest for Good Leadership in Nigeria" *The Punch Newspaper*. March 4, 2013. Print.

Anderson, L. *They Smell Like Sheep: Spiritual Leadership for the 21st Century*. West Monroe, LA: Howard Publishing, 1997. Print.

Asaju, Kayode and Isa Mukaila. "Vision 20:2020 Realities and Challenges." *Journal of Research and National Development.* Vol. 3. No 1, 2012. Print.

Ashton, John. *The Understanding of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992. Print.

Arowolo, D.E and Aluko, O. A. "Democracy, Political Participation and Good Governance in Nigeria". *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*. Special Issue: Development and Sustainability in Africa -Part 1 Vol 1No 3. 2012. Print.

Attridge, Harold. *Hebrews.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989. Print.

Babalola, R. "The Paradox of Nation: A Social Economic Perspective". *Economic Confidential*. March 15, 2010. Print.

Bailey, Kenneth. *The Cross and the Prodigal*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall INC, 1980. Print.

Baldwin, Charles. *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982. Print.

Banchoff, Thomas F. *Democracy and the Religious Pluralism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.

_ _ _ *Religious Pluralism, Globalization, and World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Barker, James N. "Ancient Compositional Practices and the Gospels: A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literatrure.* Vol.135. No3 2016. Print.

Barret, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Notes on the Greek* Text. 2nd Ed. London: SPCK, 1978. Print.

_ _ _ *New Testament Theology*. London: SPCK, 1983. Print.

Bass, B.M. *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, & Managerial Applications.* (4th Ed.) New York, NY: Free Press. 2008. Print.

Beale, G.K. and Carson, D. A. (Ed.) *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament.* Michigan: Grand Rapids, 2007. Print.

Beasley-Murray. (Ed.) *Word Biblical Commentary: John*. Collegville: Liturgical Press, 1991. Print.

_ _ _ *The Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Doubleday Publications, 1991. Print.

Bekah, Orun. *Flawed Politics: The Debacle of a crumbled Giant*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books, 1999. Print.

Bonino, M. J. *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age.* New York: Orbis Books, 2003. Print.

Borowski, Oded. *The Principle of Shepherding as a Method of Leadership.* Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992. Print.

Bratton, Michael and Nicolas Van de Walle. *Democratic Experiments in Africa: Regime Transitions in Comparative Perspective*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

Brettler, Marc Zvi. "The Role of Shepherds in Israel" *Journal for Study of Old Testament*. Vol. 12 No. 4 2013. Print.

Bromiley, G. W. Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. (eds.) *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Michigan: Grand Rapids Publishing. 1985. Print.

Brown, Raymond. *The Gospel and the Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary*. New York: St. Paul Publication. 1993. Print.

_ _ _ An *Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Doubleday, 1997. Print.

_ _ _ *New Testament Essays.* New York: Doubleday Religion, 2010. Print.

Bruce, F.F. *The Gospel of John*. Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1994. Print.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976. Print.

_ _ _ The *Gospel of John: A Commentary.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001. Print.

Caird, G. B. *The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics.* Minneapolis: Fortress,1969. Print.

Carnes, P.G. *Like Sheep without A Shepherd: The Shepherd Metaphor & Its Primacy for Biblical Leadership*. Chicago: Loyola Press, 2007. Print.

Carlyle, Thomas. *Heroes and Hero Worship*. McGraw-Hill: Harper & Row Publishers Inc. 1841. Print.

Carson, D.A. "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel. The Tyandale New Testament Lecture" *Tyandale Bulletin*, 1982. Print.

_ _ _ The *Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B Eerdmans, 1991. Print.

Chabal, Patrick (Ed.) *Political Domination in Nigeria: Reflections on the Limits of Power*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986. Print.

Chatham House Report. "Collective Action on Corruption in Nigeria: A Social Norms Approach to Connecting Society and Institutions." May 2017. Print.

Chigbu, U. "Viewing Nigeria's Bad Governance in the Context of Bad Followership". http:/nigeriaworld.com/articles/2018/dec/031.html.

Chioma, Rita. *Goodluck Jonathan: Man of many Faces*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension publishing Co. Ltd. 2014. Print.

Childs, Brevard. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* New York: Crossroads, 2001. Print.

Coogan, D. Michael. *The Old Testament: A Historical and Literary Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Croatto, J. Severino. *Biblical Hermeneutics: Toward a Theory of Reading as the Production of Meaning.* Orbis Books: Maryknoll, NY, 1987. Print.

Danker, F. W. A *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature.* (3rd rev. ed.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 2000. Print.

Davis, A. M. "Leading the Church in Today's World: What it Means Practically to Shepherd God's Flock". Merkle B. L & Schremer T. R Eds. *Shepherding God's Flock: Biblical Leadership in the New Testament and Beyond.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Ministry, 2014. Print.

D'Souza, A. *Leaders for Today Hope for Tomorrow, Empowering and Empowered Leadership*. Nairobi: Paulines Publication, 2004. Print.

Deffinbaugh, Bob. “The Good Shepherd (John 10:1-18)”, That You Might Believe: A Study of the Gospel of John, August 20th 2004. Accessed March 24, 2017.

Demosthenes, Evagoras. “The Funeral Speech*” Journal Biblical Literature* Vol. 121/2 2000. Print.

Dempster, Stephen. *Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible*. Onatrio: IVP Academic, 2003. Print.

Dillard, Raymond. *An Introduction to the Old Testament.* Westminster: Dropsie University Press, 1994. Print.

Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978. Print.

Dukor, M. “Ethnic Nationalism and a Theory of Nation Building” in Maduabuchi Dukor (Ed) *Philosophy and Politics: Discourse on Values, Politics and Power in Africa*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, 2003. Print.

_ _ _ “The Military and African Revolution” Maduabuchi Dukor (Ed) *Philosophy and Politics: Discourse on Values, Politics and Power in Africa*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, 2003. Print.

Dunnamah, A.Y. “Corruption Control and Political Stability in Nigeria: Implication for Value

Re-orientation in Politics.” Global Journal of Human Social Science. Vol 13 Issue 1.0

2013. Print.

Dunn, D.G. James. (Ed.) *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Michigan: Grand Rapids, 2003. Print.

Eerdman, B. Clemens. *Searching for the Good Shepherd*. LA: Howard Publishers, 1997. Print.

Egbegbulun, Ese. *Nigerian Leadership: The Bane on Development*. Ibadan: Heinenmann Educational Books, 2005. Print.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. Print.

Ehusani, George. "Nigeria and the Challenge of Leadership." Abuja: *Paper Presentation at Interfaith Seminar,* 2012. Print.

Ekpu, Ray. "Obasanjo's whims: Lessons of a Dictator". *The Punch* Newspaper, June 16, 2010. Print.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: Introduction*. Chicago: Loyola Press, 2001. Print.

Oxford University Press, 1991. Print.

Elaigwu, Peter. *Leadership Theories and Practice*. Lagos: Sovereign 2011. Print.

Engstrom, T. W. *The Making of a Christian Leader*. Michigan: The Zondervan Corporation, 1976. Print.

Esson, Jeremy. *Political Leadership as a Causative Phenomenon: Some Recent Analyses*. World Politics. 2004. Print.

Esu, I. E. *The Making of Nigeria: Forty Years After*. (Ed.) Lagos, Nigeria: Sovereign Prints. 2001. Print.

Fawole, A. "Diplomatic Blunders: The Ogoni Crisis and Nigeria's External Relations" *Nigeria Journal of Politics* Lagos: Lagos State University, 1999. Print.

Fillion, L.C. *The Way of Christ Vol. 3.* London: B. Herder Books Co. 1973. Print.

Ford, Mike. "The Shepherd's Voice". *Forerunner*. Vol.2 No. 11, December 1993. Print.

Galton, Francis. *Hereditary Genius.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970. Print.

Gan, Jonathan. "The Metaphor of the Shepherd in Zechariah 11: 4-17" *Biblical Quarterly* Vol.10 No.11 2013. Print.

Gangel, Kenneth. *Competent to Lead: A Guide to Management*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1973. Print.

George, Kennedy A. *Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civil Discourse.* New York: Oxford University Press. 1991. Print.

George, G. Moodley. *Jesus as the Good Shepherd in John's Gospel.* 28 Sept. 2017. Web. 20 Dec. 2018. <htt://www.shepherd.org>

Gerd, Ambrose. *Shepherd and Flock: Lessons on Sacrifice*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004. Print.

Gordon, Fee D. *New Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Students and Pastors*. 3rd Ed. Louisville: Westminster, John Knox, 2002. Print.

Golding, T. A. "The Imagery of Shepherding in the Bible Part 1," *Biblio-Theca Sacra*, 2006. Print.

Grant M. Robert and Tracy David. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible.* 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.print.

Green, Joel B. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. (Ed.) England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2013. Print.

Greenleaf, R. K. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1997. Print.

Grigsby, B. "The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel," *JSNT* 13, 1982. Print.

Grudem, W. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Nottingham, England: Inter-Varsity Press.1994. Print.

Grundman, Nathal. *The Leadership of the Anthill*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1989. Print.

Guder, D. L. "Theological Formation for Mission Practice." Mortenson V & Nielsen A. O. eds. *Walk Humbly with the Lord: Church and Mission Engaging Plurality.* Grand

Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2010. Print.

Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. London: The Tyandale Press, 1970. Print.

Gunter, Nathan. "The Shepherd-Leader Motif as Pastoral Model For a Globalizing Church" *Perichoresis*. Volume 16, Issue 3. 2018. Print.

Gyekye, K. "Political Corruption: A Philosophical Inquiry into a Moral Problem" Dukor Maduabuchi (Ed.) *Philosophy and Politics: Discourse on Values, Politics and Power in Africa*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, 2003. Print.

Hackett, Jo Ann. *Introduction To Biblical Hebrew: English and Hebrew Edition.* Indiana: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010. Print.

Hahn, Scott. *The Promise and the Power of the Sacraments.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2009. Print.

Harrelson, Walter J. *The New Interpreters Study Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003. Print.

Harris, W. H. "Exegetical Commentary on John 10". Online Article. Accessed from http://www.bible.org/page. March 10, 2019.

Henten, Van Willem Jan. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People*. Leiden: Brill,1997. Print.

Hick, John & Brian Hebblethwaite. *Christianity and Other Religions: Selected Readings*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981. Print.

Heiser, S. Michael. *Reversing Hermon: Enoch, The Watchers and the Forgotten Mission of Jesus Christ.* Downers Grove: Defender Publishing, 2017. Print.

Hildebrandt, T. *Mastering New Testament Greek Textbook.* Grand Rapids, Baker Academic. 2003. Print.

Hugo, Oderberg. "Jesus the Judge: Forensic Process in John" *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Vol.2 1987. Print.

Human Rights Watch: "Criminal Politics, Violence, Godfatherism and Corruption in Nigeria" 2007. Print.

Ibekwe, Johnson. *Between Yar'Adua and Jonathan: Issues of Governance and Credibility*. Jos: Fab Educational Books, 2014. Print.

Idada, W. and Uhunmwuangho, S.O. "Problems of Democratic Governance in Nigeria: The Way Forward". *Journal of Sociology Society* Vol 3 (1) 2012. Print.

Ihejiamaizu, E. C. *Formal Organizations: Theory, Structure and Dynamics*. Calabar, Nigeria: Clearlines Publications, 1996. Print.

Ihonvbere, J. "Leadership and Sustainability of Democracy in Nigeria." *Text of Lecture Delivered to mark the Inauguration of the Edo State Chapter of the Yar'Adua/ Jonathan Solidarity Forum, at the Oba Akenzua Cultural Centre, Benin City, Edo State. June 27*, 2009. Print.

Jack W. Vancil. "Sheep, Shepherd" The Anchor Bible Dictionary. Freeman, New York: Doublday, 1992. Print.

Jay P. Green. (Ed. /transl.) *The Interlinear Bible* Vol. IV. London: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007. Print.

Joachim, Jeremias. *New Testament Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1971. Print.

Josani, Iliya. *Pre-bendal Politics and the Quest for Godfatherism*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2002. Print.

Julius-Adeoye, R. J. "Nigerian Economy, Social Unrest and the Nation's Popular Drama". Afro *Asian Journal of Social Sciences* Vol 2, No 2.3 Quarter III. 2011. Print.

Jurgen, Moltmann. *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimension*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1990. Print.

_ _ _ *The Living God and the Fullness of Life*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013. Print.

Kapena, S. *How to be a Wise Leader, Principles that Work*. Nairobi: Paulines Publishers, 2004. Print.

Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Mass Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007. Print.

Käsemann, Ernst. *A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*. Minneapolis: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2017. Print.

Kasper, Walter. *Mercy: The Essence of the Gospel and the Key to Christian Life*. New York: Paulist Press, 2014. Print.

Kelly, Anthony and Moloney, Francis. *Experiencing God in the Gospel of John.* Paulist Press, 2003. Print.

Kii, Pius. *Priests and Laity in Politics: The Stand of the Magisterium*. Enugu: SNAAP Press Ltd, 1998. Print.

King James Version. Sword Franklin, TN: Equipping Ministries, 1992. Print.

Kilinski, Kenneth and Wofford, Jerry. *Organization and Leadership Practice*. Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1973. Print.

Keener, S. Craig. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary.* Volume 1 Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc, 2003. Print.

Koester, Craig. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*. Atlanta: Fortress Press, 1995. Print.

Kofarmata, Azumi. "The Years of Obasanjo the Tragedy of Mis-rule" International Report on Leadership in Africa. n.d

Kostenberger, A. J. *John: Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Michigan: Grand Rapids, 2004. Print.

Kovacs, Judith. "Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out': Jesus' Death as Cosmic

Battle in John 12:20-36" *Journal Biblical Literature*. Vol114/1 1995. Print.

Kukah, Hassan M. "After Insurgency: Some Thoughts on Reconciliation in Nigeria". 43rd Convocation Lecture of the University of Nigeria, Nsuka, 28th March, 2014. Print.

_ _ _ "Though Tribe and Tongue May Differ: Managing Diversity in Nigeria". Pre-Convocation Lecture Delivered at the University of Abuja, February 24th 2016. Print.

_ _ _ *The Church and Politics of Social Responsibility*. Lagos: Sovereign 2007. Print.

Kummel, W.G. *Introduction to the New Testament Study Edition*. London: SCM Press Ltd. 2011. Print.

Laniak, S. Timothy. *Finding the Lost Images of God: Uncover the Ancient Culture, Discover Hidden Meanings*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 2012. Print.

Lattimore, Richard. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942. Print.

Lawal, T. and Owolabi D. "Leadership Debacle: The Bane of Good Governance in Nigeria." *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences* Vol 3, No 3.3 2012. Print.

Lee, Dorothy A. "The Good Shepherd of John" (Ed.) *The New Interpreter's One-Volume Bible Commentary.* Nashville: Abingdon, 2010. Print.

Leocrates, Tabor. *A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom among Christians and Jews in Antiquity.* San Francisco: Harper, 1992. Print.

Leon-Dufour, Xavier. *Dictionary of Biblical Theology.* (Ed.) London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1970. Print.

Loraux, Nicole. *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1986. Print.

Lucien, Richard. "The Many Deaths of Jesus" *The Way.* Vol. 33 No. 4. 1993. Print.

Luke Timothy J. *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*. New Delhi: Theological Publishers, 2009. Print.

Lysias, Onoledi. *Funeral Oration in Greek Mythology*. New York: Basic Books, 1990. Print.

Mangu, Andre Mbata. "State Reconstruction, Leadership Legitimacy and Deomcratic Governance in Africa." Politeia Vol 27 No 2. 2008. Print.

Mahammad, Hill. *The Theory and Practice of Leadership of the Sokoto Caliphate*. Zaria, Nigeria: ABU Press, 2005. Print.

Martyn, A. *The Johannine Community and the Charism of the Essenes*. Illinois: Crossway Books, 2006. Print.

Mattingly, L. Gerard. "Shepherd" *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. Ed. Achtemeier, Paul J. San Francisco CA: Harper Collins Publishers, 1985. Print.

Mason, Thomas. " 'Aristotle' History of Greek Philosophy" *Lecture Notes* STAMS, 1992.

McKenzie, Alyee M. *Jesus the Good Shepherd: Reflections on John 10:1-18.* London: SCM Press, 2014. Print.

Meier, John. *A Marginal Jew: Re-thinking the Historical Jesus.* New York: Doubleday Publications, 1991. Print.

Melaba, Daniel. *Church in Nigeria: Our Pains, Our Hopes*. Makurdi: Aboki Publishers, 2009. Print.

Metzger, B. M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd Edition Stuttgart: German Bible Society. 1994. Print.

Menexenus, Dionysius. *The Art of Greek Poetry.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956. Print.

Mingana, A. *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: The Manuscript Evidence.* Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc, 2001. Print.

Mokuulo, O. and Abubakre, F. "Carrington Blames Nigeria's Woes on the Neglect of the Agric Sector." *UNILORIN Bulletin*, October 28. Vol. 5 No. 98. 2013. Print.

Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998. Print.

Moltmann, Jurgen. *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimension*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1989. Print.

Mounce, W.D. *Basics of Biblical Greek: Grammar*. (2nd ed.) Michigan: Grand Rapids, 2003. Print.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John.* Longernecker: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000. Print.

Moyosore, Shuaib O. "Corruption in Nigeria: Causes, Effects and Probable Solutions" *Journal of Political Science and Leadership Research* Vol. 1 No.8 2015. Print.

Munroe, M. *The Spirit of Leadership*. New Kensington: Whitaker House, 2005. Print.

New Telegraph. TSA Implementation. August 15th 2017. Print.

Newbigin, Lesslie. *The Light Has Come.* Longernecker: Eerdmans Publishing Co. 1982. Print.

Neyrey, Jerome H. *An Ideology of Revolt: John's Christology in Social-Science Perspective.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. Print.

_ _ _ "The 'Noble Shepherd' in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background" *Journal Biblical Literature*. Vol. 120 No.3 2001. Print.

Nnablife, N. K. E. "Defining and Enforcing Ethical Leadership in Nigeria." *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies.* Vol. 1 No. 1. 2010. Print.

Nnoli, Okwudiba. *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers, 1978. Print.

Nnonyelu, Herbert. *Nigerian Leadership: Yesterday and Today.* Nimo: Rex Charles and Patrick Limited. 2008. Print.

Nurudeen, Abdallah. *Yar'Adua: The Icon of Peoples Democratic Movement (PDM).*Zaria: Gaskyia Corporation Limited, 2016. Print.

Nwaorgu, O.G. Y. "Ethnic Suspicion in Nigerian Politics" Maduabuchi Dukor (Ed.) *Philosophy and Politics: Discourse on Values, Politics and Power in Africa.* Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, 2003. Print.

Nwaeze, John. "African Presidents and the Plight of the Masses." *World Politics*. Vol.36. No.1, 2007. Print.

Nwekeaku, C. "The Rule of Law, Democracy and Good Governance in Nigeria." *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration.* Vol. 2, No 1March 2014. Print.

O'Grady, John F. "Good Shepherd and the Vine and the Branches" *BTB* 8 1978. Print.

Obasanjo, Olusegun. "N'Assembly Members are a Bunch of Unarmed Robbers" *The Punch.* 2017. Print.

Odafe, John. *Faithful Citizenship: A Call to Political Responsibility*. Enugu: SNAAP Press Ltd, 2003. Print.

Odey, John. *Christians, Politics and the Nigerian Dilemma*. Enugu: SNAAP Press Ltd. 1999. Print.

Odisu, T. A "Leadership Recruitment Process and the Travails of Development in Nigeria" *Journal of Political Science and Public Affairs*. October, 2017. Print.

Odukoya, Taiwo. *Premium Times*. April 27, 2014. Print.

Oduyoye, Mercy. *Who Will Roll Away the Stone?* Geneva: World Council of Churches Press, 1990. Print.

Ogbinika, Karo. *The Military Sovereignty and Democracy in Africa*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, 2003. Print.

Okaneme, Godwin. “The Challenges of Leadership and Governance in Nigeria” *Covenant Journal of Politics and International Affairs* Vol. 5 No. 1 June 2017. Print.

Okoro, J. *Leadership Style and Autonomous Communities: A case study.* Enugu, Nigeria: SNAAP Press Ltd. 2005. Print.

Olaoye, Dorcas. *The Leadership Problem in Nigeria*. Ibadan: JODAD Publishers, 2013. Print.

Omoyibo, K. U. “Leadership, Governance, and Poverty in Nigeria.” *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 4 No 6 MCSER-CEMAS-Sapienza University of Rome. 2013. Print.

Onyeso, A. A. *Leadership: Key to Development and Progress*. Abuja: Speadmo Nigeria Limited, 2013. Print.

Orchard, Helen C. “Courting Betrayal: Jesus as Victim in the Gospel of John”. *JSNT* Vol. 161, 1998. Print.

Oscar, Wilde. *Despising the Shame of the Cross: Honour and Shame in the Johannine Narrative.* Nashville: Boardman and Holman, 1992. Print.

Osumah, O. and Ikelegbe, A. “The Poeples Democratic Party and Governance in Nigeria, 1999-2007”. *Journal Social Science:* Kamla-Raj, 1 Vol 9 No 3. 2009. Print.

Osweto, Ronard. *The Gospel of John: A New Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.

Othman, Zaleha and Rahman R. A. “Attributes of Ethical Leadership in Leading Good Governance”. *International Journal of Business and Society.* Vol. 15No 2. 2009. Print.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Jesus-God and Man*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964. Print.

Perkins, Pheme. *Reading the New Testament* (2nd Ed.) New York: Paulist Press, 1988. Print.

Phelps, O. *Leading Like Jesus: Introducing Leadership, Servant, Steward, Shepherd*. Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Publishing Division, 2009. Print.

Pilch John and Malina, Bruce. (Eds.) *Handbook of Biblical Social Values.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1998. Print.

Porter, S. E. (ed.) *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. New York: Brill Academic Publishers, 1997. Print.

Reid, Daniel G. Ed. *The IVP Dictionary of the New Testament: A One-Volume Compendium of Contemporary Scholarship.* Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 2004. Print.

Ridderbos, H. N. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1997. Print.

Riggio, R.E. & Murphy. S.E. et al (Eds.) *Multiple Intelligence and Leadership*. London: Chapman, 1999. Print.

Ripley, Jason J. "Killing as Piety? Exploring Ideological Contexts Shaping the Gospel of John." *Journal of Biblical Literature.* Vol. 134 No.3 2015. Print.

Ropher, Gabir. "African Leaders: A Case of who Has the Knife and Bread". *Loyola Journal of Social Science*, Jul-Dec Vol. 25, Issue 2. 2003. Print.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1934. Print.

Rudolf, Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to John*. New York: Crossroads, 1982. Print.

Schaller, Lyle. *Leadership and the Crisis of Democracy*. New York: Alfred Knopt, 2001. Print.

Schmidt, L. Peter. *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideas of Humanism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989. Print.

Schoonenberg, Piet. *The Christ*. London: Sheed & Ward Ltd. 1974. Print.

Seeley, David. *The Noble Death. Graeco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's Concept of Salvation.* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990. Print.

Seteolu, D. *The Challenges of Leadership and Governance in Nigeria.* Lagos: Panaf Press, 2004. Print.

Seuss, Theodor Geisel. *Shape of me and Other Stuff.* Dallas: Omega Publishers,1973. Print.

Sheen, F. J. *To Know Christ.* London: Sheed & Ward, 1962. Print.

Soren, Nestwel. *Shepherds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Print.

Soyinka, Wole. "Sunrise Daily" *Channels Television.* February 15, 2018.

Stogdill, M. T. "Leadership in Hyper-Organized Societies". *The American Political Science Review.* 1987. Print.

Stuhlmueller, Carrol. (ed.) *The Collegeville Pastoral Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Bangalore: Theological Publications, 2005. Print.

Tanko, B. Peter. *The Christian Association of Nigeria and the Challenge of the Ecumenical Imperative*. Jos: Fab Anieh Nig. Ltd, 1993. Print.

The Holy Bible. "Revised Standard Version". Catholic Edition, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1966. Print.

Thielman, F. *Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach.* Michigan: Grand Rapids, 2005. Print.

The New Jerusalem Bible. London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 1985. Print.

Tidball, D. *Ministry by the Book: New Testament Patterns for Pastoral Leadership*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic. 2018. Print.

Tolarin, Sheriff. "Africa's Leadership Challenges in the 21st Century: A Nigerian Perspective". *Tribune.* May 27, 2010. Print.

Toryough, Godwin N. "Jesus Christ as a Revolutionary in An African Perspective: An Exegesis of John 2:12-17" *Christology in African Context.* (Ed.) NABIS Number 2 Ibadan: Philarem Corporate Printers, 2003. Print.

Trent, C. Butler. (Ed.) *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. Tennessee: Holman Publishers, 2003. Print.

Turner, J. D. *History of Religions Background of John 10*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Print.

Ubochi, T. C. and Benedict, N. "The Failure of Governance and Leadership in Nigeria: Abia State as a Pictorial Case Study (1)". *Nigeria World*, (http://nigeria world.com/feature/publication/ubochi/011509.html. retrieved on the 1st March, 2019.

Umoh, Camillus. "The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Implication for a Sustainable Democracy in Africa" *Church and Democracy in West Africa.* Port-Harcourt, CIWA Publications, 2003. Print.

Uruah, Peterside. "Nigerian and the World: Re-thinking Nigeria (3)" *The Guardian.* Vol. 4 No 2. 2016. Print.

Venar, Bede. *Our Votes Must Count: Lessons of the 2015 Elections.* Abuja: Speadmo Nigeria Limited, 2015. Print.

Verbrugge, V.D. (ed.) *New International Dictionary of the New Testament*. Michigan: Grand Rapids, 2000. Print.

Vine, W.E. *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*. Nashville Thomas Nelson, Inc. 1996. Print.

Wallace, D.B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1996. Print.

Warren, G. Bennis. *The Dynamics of Leadership in the 21st Century*. New York: Orbis Books, 2012. Print.

Whitacre, R. A. *John.* England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1999. Print.

Wolfhart, Pannenberg. *Jesus: God and Man.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964. Print.

Wolinski, Steve. *The Principles of Leadership: An Approach towards Inclusion*. New York: Harper & Row, 2001. Print.

Wright, N. Thomas. *Christian Origins and the Question of God: The New Testament and the People of God.* London: SPCK Publishers, 2013. Print.

Yarborough Larry & L. Michael (Eds.) *The Social World of the First Christians*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995. Print.

Young, R. A. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*. Nashville, Tennessee: Boradman & Holman Publishers, 1994. Print.